The Catholic Historical Review

Volume XXIV APRIL, 1938 No. 1

THE "MORE PERFECT UNION": THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS SEEKS A FORMULA [1]

One hundred and fifty years ago, after a period of trials and tribulations and after deep searchings of hearts, consciences and purposes, a Constitution of the United States of America was set up as the guide and guardian of our national life. Out of the experiences and heart-burnings of the troublous years of a long war and its aftermath had slowly evolved a formula of government whereby political units of disparate character might dwell together in unity, concord, and effective coöperation; while at the same time privileged to go about their own business, unterrified and untrammeled, each master in its own house. And, though this Constitution was launched upon a stormy and uncertain sea, amid a multitude of doubts and perplexities, the nation for which it was builded has grown in stature, has waxed strong, and has seemed to thrive beyond the most exultant dreams of its founders.

In some manner, during this century and a half, the idea has grown up in the national consciousness that the makers of the Constitution did a pretty good job, that the plan was well devised for

[1] This paper is based mainly on *The Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789* (Library of Congress edition, 1904-1937) and *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* (eight volumes, ed. Edmund C. Burnett, Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1921-1936). It was read in part at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association at Philadelphia, December 29, 1937.

33988

the purposes for which it was instituted, and that the building was true to the plan. Therefore it is that the nation has come to take a profound pride in its Constitution, crediting to the wisdom and beneficence of that instrument a great measure of the national progress. And so it has come about that, in this year of our Lord nineteen hundred and thirty-seven and of the Constitution of the United States the one hundred and fiftieth, we gather ourselves together in groups here and there to glorify the noble instrument of our union, to sing the praises of its makers, and even, when our voices will hold out, to boast somewhat of our national achievements.

How passing strange that these sesquicentennial celebrations of the Constitution should have fallen upon a time when the great river of our national life is in a raging flood, its once placid waters stirred to their muddy, noisome depths, its dreadsome torrent tossing and swirling upon its surface all manner of wreckage and noxious debris, much of it swept in upon the current by tributary streams that have come from laying waste fair valleys or have crept darkly down through forbidding gorges! It is a scene that delighteth not the eye, neither do the nostrils find pleasure therein. The very roar of the torrent stirs in us a dread of dangers we know not what. Strange indeed is it that, in the midst of such confusion and confronted by such dread portents, we should be pouring out full measures of our fervor and our zeal, should be tuning our harps for songs of praise and thanksgiving, for institutions which we acclaim as blessings! Can it be that the hymns we raise are but as the song sung by the swan of the fable as he floated down the stream to die?

All these things we are doing as though quite unmindful of the fact that at this moment termites are busily working at the foundation sills of the government which we are exalting, that rodents are gnawing at the walls of the superstructure, and that hordes of poisonous suspicions respecting the soundness of the structure and the competence of the builders have been turned loose to slither and squirm in the popular mind; while that very Constitution which is the chief object of our worshipful acclamations has become a target for a rabble crew, whose missiles would seem to have been gathered mainly from the garbage pail or snitched from the setting hen.

"Why", sneer the critics and professional smearers, "those old boneheads who wrote the Constitution lived, moved, and had their beings in an age so remote that the speediest speeder for the transportation of *homo sapiens* was a horse with his tail over the dashboard. And, what is just as bad, if not worse, they actually wrote their old Constitution, so we are told, by the light of a tallow candle. Now, for our advanced and complex age, the age of light, speed, gadgets, and unending noises, no constitution would be worth its ounce of pulp unless written on a bustling sidewalk, amid the roar of automobiles on the street, the deafening whirr of airplanes overhead, and in the dazzling glare of neon lights." These be hard sayings. Who can hear them? We may, notwithstanding, at least take comfort in the knowledge that the makers of the Constitution, call them boneheads if you will, used brains instead of bowels for their motive power.

Some of those who, a century and a half ago, looked on with high elation at the launching of the new instrument of government were pleased to name it "The Good Ship Constitution". "The Good Ship Constitution, forsooth!", snort the critics. "Why, that old ship was clumsily built in the first place, its prow ill-shapen, its keel improperly laid, and all so long ago that by this time many of its timbers must surely be decayed. Moreover, it no longer has capacity for the loads it must now carry." But what evidence, it is asked, have these critics given that they themselves are able to qualify as first-class constitutional shipmasters? We trust them not. Despite, then, the mouthings of the skeptics, despite the proclamations and the preachments, the declamations and the diatribes, which but serve to tickle the broad ears of the Demos, to coax the Great Unwashed,[2] and to lure the Great Unwashable, some there are who have not yet bowed the knee to Baal, but remain steadfast in the faith that it is still "The Good Ship Constitution". For has it not triumphantly sailed the Seven Seas, weathered unnumbered storms, and brought us safely into this good harbor? Does it need repairs? they ask. Well, go to, make them. Is it somewhat in need

[2] This appellation, according to the best available evidence, is to be credited (or debited) to Horace Maynard of Tennessee (1814-1882), sometime member of Congress and postmaster general under President Hayes.

of remodeling? Come, then, let us do that. But, whatever else we do, let us take heed that scuttlers be not concealed in the hold.[3]

To be somewhat more factual, some there are (shall I say, a chosen few?) who, long ago convinced that the system of federal government evolved during the early years of our national history is among the foremost contributions of all time to the theory and practice of government among men, still hold fast to the conviction that, given rational understanding and rational endeavor, common sense and common honesty of purpose, our federal system, in its fundamental principles, offers to the United States and to the world the most practicable, the most perfect system of government yet devised.

If, then, while giving all due diligence to acclaiming the dayspring of our national being, we shall be enabled, despite the dread portents that darken our skies, to add to our faith those other virtues commended to us by Saint Peter—knowledge, temperance, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness, charity—we may hold fast to the hope that in due time these darksome clouds will pass away, the sun will shine once more, and that the raging river will at length yield its turbulence to calm in the great gulf of future years. Meanwhile, we can but devoutly pray to be strengthened with strength in our souls, that we may walk uprightly in the midst of trouble and falter not.

But we have looked long enough upon the mad current of our time, which threatens to strangle our faith and engulf our hopes. Come, then, let us once again lift our eyes to the hills whence cometh our help.

When we approach that confluence of many streams which is the beginning of our history as a nation, behold! there, as here today, were troubled waters; there also torrential storms and raging floods;

[3] "After the recent past the Constitution may be slightly apprehensive as it still faces a series of congressionally inspired state celebrations, ending with Rhode Island's gracious public confession that it is and has been part of the Union for a century and a half. Speaking sympathetically for the Constitution, I may say that it hopes nevertheless that at the end of another one hundred and fifty years it will still be able to speak its mother tongue, the language of ordered government translated into the idiom of an ever-changing and dynamic American Society." Presidential address of Professor Guy Stanton Ford, before the American Historical Association at Philadelphia, December 30, 1937 (*American Historical Review*, January, 1938).

and thence have come drifting all down the stream of our national life masses of flotsam, great and small, that have tended to obstruct our vision and obscure the truth.

One such bit of flotsam, one that has been much exploited though but little explored, is the contention that the Constitution as framed by the Federal Convention is the very negation of all that the Continental Congress began both to do and to say. To an indictment in this form a jury, upon hearing all the evidence, would be in duty bound to render a verdict of not guilty. True enough, it was the Federal Convention that ultimately found the long-sought solution of the problem of a " more perfect union ", but the Convention was enabled to find that solution mainly by the light of the torch supplied by the Continental Congress. Moreover, what is just as true, a great part of the materials built into the Constitution by the Federal Convention was drawn from the workshop of the Old Congress. Another and rather curious conglomeration of historical flotsam that has come down to us from what the mockers and the scoffers designate as the dark age of our national beginnings is the notion that the Continental Congress, which for some fifteen years presided over the destinies of the nation, at times, to be sure, somewhat awkwardly, yet for the most part with dignity, poise and unswerving devotion to the cause of human liberty and human rights—that the Continental Congress was a veritable old drowsyhead, much given to dozing its days away, that now and again it actually fell into deep sleep, and on occasion veritably shook the national rafters with its stertorous snoring. A modicum of evidence in support of the charge might indeed be gathered even from the accused's own diary; nevertheless, the percentage of truth in the charge is exceeding small.

If it be true that Congress sometimes dozed and on sundry occasions did deeply drowse, it is likewise true that, in its dozings and its drowsings, yea more, in its hours of watchful vigilance, its young men saw visions and its old men dreamed dreams. Those visions were indeed ofttimes dim and fleeting—mirages floating in the misty sky, treasures piled at the feet of the elusory rainbow; and the dreams were like unto them—fitful, elusive, forever entangled in the web of circumstance. Yet there came to Congress, even in its youth,

one superb vision, the vision of a new nation rising on these shores and going on from strength to strength until it became a great host, a mighty power. Likewise Congress dreamed a dream, wherein it was eternally struggling to attain the delectable, the ever-fleeting goal of its vision, forever encountering insuperable obstacles, forever thwarted by forces over which it had no control. It was as though Congress were groping along a dark and labyrinthine corridor, searching for the door which, if opened, would admit the light. In the language of old Omar, though slightly paraphrased:

> There was the door to which they found no key;
> There was the veil through which they might not see.

The elemental truth is that the Continental Congress was itself but a manifestation, though but vaguely defined, of an idea of union among the colonies that had its germinal beginnings quite early in their life-history. But an equally fundamental truth—that which for this nonce is truth to me and shall, I ween, be truth to thee—is that, by the conjunctures and purposes of time, it devolved upon the Continental Congress to nurse that idea into vigorous growth, to seek to bring it up in the way it should go. That nursing, or what I have chosen to call the search for a formula, began when Congress first took its place on the national stage; and, though hearts at times grew faint, and spirits were often chilled by the wintry winds of failure, though now and again states as well as individuals seemed to weary of the struggle through the tangled wilderness and the slough of despond, that search was never wholly given over at any time throughout the hectic and checkered life of that assembly.

The search presents itself in two distinct periods. The one, extending from the first assembling of the Congress in September, 1774, and culminating with the final ratification of the Articles of Confederation in March, 1781, is a fairly familiar domain; for many historical sportsmen have hunted in that great game-preserve, some diligently, others no more than cursorily, and one or another of them has now and then stumbled upon a mare's nest or given chase to a white rabbit. A somewhat differing period of search comprises the remaining years that were permitted to that body which we call the Continental Congress. Of the first period we shall seek to make

but a swift survey, a sort of airplane recognizance; over the second we may choose to hover a bit, taking here and there a snapshot of the rugged scenery below.

At the very outset, so some maintained at the time and many more have contended since, Congress got off on the wrong foot by adopting for its own use the rule of one-colony-one-vote, whether the colony be big, little, or middle-sized. Under the circumstances then existing a different rule could not have been obtained; but having once hung that motto over its door, Congress was never, never able to take it down; and there it remained, a plague to Congress in its every waking hour, a nightmare to its slumbers. Indeed, it all but sent the members of the Federal Convention crawling in humility and defeat back to their several caverns.

It was likewise in this first gathering of 1774 that Congress was offered its first job as a nurse. The Loyalist Joseph Galloway offered Congress a plan of union for the colonies, but upon a very casual inspection it proved to have been designed primarily to draw a bit tighter the cords that bound the colonies to Great Britain. Few were as yet harboring thoughts of independence, but just as few had any hankerings for the tautening of the maternal apron strings. Therefore, spake Congress to Galloway and all such as might be aiders and abettors in this piece of effrontery: "Take that brat out of the nursery! Remove it far from me. As far as the East is from the West, remove thou it." And lo! it was removed.[4]

By the time the second Congress assembled in May, 1775, the American cauldron was violently hissing and seething, and the need for united efforts by the colonies had grown accordingly. By this time also the idea of a permanent union had begun to take on form and substance in some minds. It was such a thought that prompted Benjamin Franklin, in July of that year, to offer a plan of union which, he ventured to suggest, members might be turning over in their minds. But even in that valorous assembly there were many "timid members", as Jefferson characterized them, and they thrust

[4] See the *Journals*, I, 43-52 (Sept. 28, 1774), and *Letters of Members*, I, 51-59, 80, 88.

Franklin's project far back into a dark pigeonhole.[5] Another year, and independence, a few months before only a timid whisper, had become the loudest roar in all America. But if the idea of independence had grown rapidly and had at last laid its grip upon the states and upon Congress, so also had the idea of union, and side by side with the advancing spirit of independence marched the hope for a confederation of the states-to-be. A committee of Congress set about the task of constructing a constitution for their confederation, yet scarcely any two men were agreed on what the formula of that confederation ought to be. To what extent should the colonies, which had grown up as distinct political, social, and economic entities, merge their individualities into that altogether problematical thing, a confederation? In what manner and by what means might they band themselves together the better to effect the purposes which were common to them all? How might their several strengths be multiplied into one another and yet preserve their own strengths undiminished? Might it not be a mere swapping of chains? Might not the creature turn and rend its creators? These were serious questions, and to them no man as yet had the answers. Throughout the long search for the answers the fears that were stirred in that early summer of 1776 never wholly subsided. And who shall say that the Jeremiahs of 1788 were altogether false prophets in their forewarnings of dangers to come?

Chief among the questions at issue, as is well known, was whether the states should stand on an equality or have voices and duties proportioned to population or to wealth or both. The disputations raged with fury and with froth through many weeks, and even then came to a lull mainly because of the exhaustion of the contestants.[6]

[5] Franklin's plan was laid before Congress July 21, 1775. See the *Journals* under that date (vol. II, 195). For Jefferson's remarks see his *Writings* (ed. P. L. Ford), IV, 310.

[6] The index (item, "Confederation") to vol. II of *Letters of Members* will guide any reader who may wish to follow the discussions of the subject, in so far as those discussions have been revealed. Some notes of the debates, recorded by John Adams and Jefferson, not included in the *Letters*, are conveniently found in an appendix to the *Journals* (VI, 1076, 1098, respectively). The proceedings in Congress may be followed by means of the index to the *Journals* for 1776 and 1777.

Just when the antagonists were recovering their second wind and were sharpening the swords of their argument and their rhetoric for a renewal of the fray, came the warning cry, one December day, "The Red Coats!" Fear must have gripped the collective heart of that assembly, for, however great their personal courage, it were not well for the great cause they represented that the British army make captive any part of that body. Congress, nevertheless, as became men to whom had been entrusted the destinies of the infant nation, stoutened the heart and stiffened the upper lip and indited a resolution instructing General Washington to contradict the "scandalous report" that Congress was "about to disperse", adding the solemn declaration: "Nor will they adjourn from the city of Philadelphia . . . until the last necessity shall direct it". On the morrow, notwithstanding, the last necessity, or what was interpreted so to be, directed it, and Congress with one accord betook itself to Baltimore.[7] Did I say, with one accord? Well, if in after days one would listen to the stories told by stout hearts who had joined that historic caravan that wended its weary way from Philadelphia to Baltimore, some had been opposed to a flight so precipitate. Now, a dignified and unhurried jog across the country, that would have been befitting an assembly reputed to be august and eager not to sully its reputation. For example, we have it upon the testimony of Dr. Benjamin Rush that Samuel Adams, for one, protested with such vehemence that, as he spoke, he rose upon his toes.[8] If the honorable Samuel did not thereafter take to his heels, he was at least presently to be observed at Baltimore in the company of such as should be saved.

Now, the chapter on the Articles of Confederation for the period of Congress's sorrowful sitting at Baltimore is like unto the famous chapter on snakes in Ireland. The atmosphere of Baltimore in

[7] On December 9th, Congress had resolved to adjourn to Baltimore in the event that it became necessary to remove from Philadelphia. The order to General Washington to contradict the "scandalous report" was on the 11th. As Washington declined to publish the resolution, that and the resolution of the 9th were both afterward erased from the *Journals*. The final resolve to adjourn to Baltimore was on the 12th, the assembling at the latter place on the 20th. See *Letters of Members*, II, 174-189.

[8] *Letters of Members*, II, 179, 180 n.

those days, as all Congress did dolefully testify, was not conducive to constitution-making.[9] Besides, a good many of the delegates declined to go there at all, and others slipped away at the first good opportunity. And thus it came about that efforts toward forming a confederation were not resumed until Congress was privileged to return to Philadelphia,[10] where the members did not have to make their way to the assembly hall on horseback through deep mud, where they had comfortable rooms in which to live, three square meals a day—or four, in a pinch—and, last but not least, where a miserable member of Congress could raise a thirst.

No sooner, however, had they recovered these durable satisfactions of life than the sometime dormant impulse to make a constitution for their union once again welled up in their souls. Followed a good many weeks of earnest labors applied to their task, and the hope that springs eternal in the human breast had begun again to bubble in their bosoms.[11] They were on the verge, so they flattered themselves, of evolving a formula, a formula for an admixture of elements such as would at least not produce an immediate explosion and might in time coalesce into a harmonious compound. But alas!

'Twas ever thus from childhood's hour,
They'd seen their fondest hopes decay.

[9] See *ibid.*, II, *passim* (index, "Baltimore"). To give only two examples out of many, Benjamin Harrison wrote, on Christmas Day, 1776, to Robert Morris (who had remained in Philadelphia): "If you desire to keep out of the Damdest Hole in the World come not here"; and William Hooper wrote to Morris, December 28: "When the Devil proffered our Saviour the Kingdoms of the World, he surely placed his thumb on this delectable spot and reserved it to himself for his own peculiar chosen seat and inheritance."

[10] Congress adjourned from Baltimore February 27, 1777, and first assembled a quorum at Philadelphia on March 12.

[11] Charles Carroll of Carrollton wrote to Benjamin Franklin, August 12, 1777: "We have not yet confederated, but almost every member of Congress is anxious for a Confederacy, being sensible, that a Confederacy formed on a rational plan will certainly add much weight and consequence to the united States collectively and give great security to each individually, and a credit also to our paper money: but I despair of such a confederacy, as ought, and would take place, if little and partial interests could be laid aside." *Letters of Members*, II, 450.

Just when they were glimpsing the goal of their long strivings (this was in September, 1777), once more their deliberations and their reveries were interrupted by the ominous tread of an approaching army—not the ragged regimentals of General Washington, but the scarlet-clad troops of the British, who would like nothing better than to bag a bunch of Congressmen. Again Congress debated whether to tarry or to travel, and in the afternoon of September 18, before their courage had sprung an ooze, they solemnly resolved that tomorrow they would enter upon the weighty business of confederation. The morrow's hour of meeting did, indeed, find every member in his seat; not, however, in his wonted seat in the hall where Congress did from day to day forgather; instead it was on the broad back of a horse headed toward Lancaster and prodded to quicken his gait. In fact, the question before the house, whether to run or not to run, had, at about the hour of midnight of that memorable September 18th, so says Thomas Burke, "received a compleat decision". Laggards there were, indeed, who had been aroused from their slumbers no earlier than the fateful hour of three o'clock in the morning and had barely time to don their going-away garments; if, indeed, they had so much of a margin of safety. A suspicion has persisted even unto this day that they were "sleeping on their arms", so to speak. Having gathered at Lancaster, according to prearranged plan, lo! hearts were still thumping in some bosoms, so one member at least averred. To be quite safe from capture by the enemy there was yet one more river to cross; accordingly, they moved on beyond the Susquehanna and took up their defiant position at the small town of York.[12]

In the quietude of York Congress worked at high tension until, as best they were able, they had put the Articles of Confederation into a shape in which it was thought the states, those thirteen stern judges who must needs hand down the verdict, might possibly approve of their handiwork. This was in mid-November, 1777.[13]

[12] There was one sitting at Lancaster on September 27; the first meeting at York was on September 30. Concerning the removal see *Letters of Members*, II, 483, 485, 491-508, 512, 525.

[13] The Articles were adopted on November 15, but printed copies were not ready for distribution until the 28th (see the note of Secretary Thomson, in

That the Articles of Confederation were full of imperfections, that they were far from meeting the desires of all the states, that they were, in fact, not wholly satisfactory to any state, none knew better than the very men who had framed them. For one thing, the old rule of one-state-one-vote remained imbedded in the Articles, and, what proved to be an even more serious obstacle to betterment, was the provision that amendment could be obtained only by the unanimous consent of the thirteen states. Still another deficiency, though not adequately sensed at the time, a deficiency that proved to be fatal to any tolerable working of the system, was destined to stretch the poor old Congress on the rack for the greater part of its life and all but wreck the whole Revolutionary cause, was the failure to make any provision for the support of the central government other than through requisitions upon the states. One taunt flung into the face of Congress by some of its own members at the time, and flung again and again in the years to come, was "rope of sand!", "rope of sand!", "rope of sand!".[14]

The blame must not, however, be laid wholly at the door of Congress. Even the Congress of the Revolution did not always trip the

the *Journals*, IX, 928). The circular letter to accompany the Articles to the several states, which was drawn by Richard Henry Lee, was approved on November 17 and bears that date (*ibid.*, 932). One paragraph of that letter deserves to be quoted here: "Hardly is it to be expected that any plan, in the variety of provisions essential to our union, should exactly correspond with the maxims and political views of every particular State. Let it be remarked, that, after the most careful enquiry and the fullest information, this is proposed as the best which could be adapted to the circumstances of all; and as that alone which affords any tolerable prospect of a general ratification." The entire letter is recommended as a compact characterization of the problems involved in framing the Articles, of the urgent necessity for the states to be bound together "by ties the most intimate and indissoluble", and as an appeal to the states to be prompt in their ratifications.

[14] John Adams is said to have made use of the expression at about the time the Articles were adopted (he was not in Congress at their final adoption). See *Letters of Members*, II, 515 n. A less rhetorical, if still not quite factual, comment was made by Cornelius Harnett of North Carolina. Writing to his absent colleague, Thomas Burke, he said: "The child Congress has been big with, these two years past, is at last brought forth—(Confederation). I fear it will by the several Legislatures be thought a little deformed,—you will think it a Monster. I wish, however, some kind of Confederation would take place" (*ibid.*, II, 547).

light fantastic toe in unison with its own heart-beats. Then, as since, though not in quite such stentorian tones, it was the constituents that called the tune. If the delegates of the smaller states had voted otherwise than they did, no doubt on their return home they would have been met a little way out of town by a delegation of their fellow-citizens, with open arms, indeed, but carrying a bucket of tar and a sack of feathers.

Unfortunately, we know all too little of what was thought and what was said during the long period of the formation of the Articles of Confederation. Although now and then there is a substantial record of some discussion, for the most part we obtain only occasional glimpses of Congress through some peep-hole as it labored and sweated, catch the sound of raucous voices, of the pounding of desks and the stomping of feet. Of course the contemporary public was not supposed to hear even that much, nor were they privileged to read reports of proceedings afterward. We, their heirs and assigns, are in a better position only to the extent that occasionally confidential reports sent by delegates to their home governments or to their friends have been preserved for our behoof. Notable among such communications are those of Thomas Burke of North Carolina in the spring of 1777 (this, it is to be borne in mind, was just after the return of Congress from its sobby winter in Baltimore to the comforts of Philadelphia). From Burke we have the revelation that Congress, to all appearances, was at one time on the point of surrendering the precious principle of state sovereignty, reserving to the states only the power of regulating the internal police. To know how astounding was this lapse we have but to remember that over and over again the Congress hall had been made to resound with the exclamation: "If I forget thee, O State Sovereignty, let my right hand forget her cunning; if I do not remember thee, O States' Rights, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth!" (Now, be it known of all men, that only once in the whole history of the Continental Congress did a Congressional tongue ever cleave to the roof of the mouth.) [15] If we may believe Thomas Burke—and there is no good reason why we should mis-

[15] See the sad story of James Sykes of Delaware, as told by himself (*ibid.*, II, 323). "As a lamb dumb before his shearers, so opened he not his mouth."

trust him—it was he who snatched Congress back to safety, just when that sometimes impulsive body was about to plunge over the precipice into a yawning abyss. It may well be that at the same time he rescued individual delegates from a baptism of tar and feathers, or its equivalent. Burke's speeches were of course heard only by that small group of men who sat in the Congress chamber. Likewise, most of the notes which he says he made of the debates on the confederation would seem, alas! to have perished. But the compact reports which he made to the governor of North Carolina, though written more than one hundred and sixty years ago, have a modern ring. "The more experience I acquire", Burke wrote, "the stronger is my conviction, that *unlimited Power can not be safely Trusted* to any man or set of men on Earth"; and he goes on to speak of "the Delusive Intoxication which Power Naturally imposes on the human mind". If, he continues,

> men so eminent as members of Congress are willing to explain away any Power that stands in the way of their particular purposes, what may we not expect some time hence, when the Seat of Power shall become firm by Habit, and man will be accustomed to Obedience, and perhaps forgetful of the Original principles which gave rise thereto? . . . Power will sometime or other be abused unless men are well watched, and checked by something which they cannot remove when they please.[16]

It is pertinent to observe here that Burke was by no means as eager as were most members of Congress to hasten the construction of the instrument of union, for he was insistent in his contention that during the turbulence of war was not a fit time for the construction of a permanent constitution: "I deem a time of peace and tranquility", he said, "the proper time for agitating so important a concern." It is altogether probable therefore that Burke was not particularly pleased with the anxieties and feverish activity at York to bring the Confederation to completion. In fact, he escaped the worst of it by departure for his own country. Let it not how-

[16] See especially Burke's letters of March 11, April 29, November 4, 1777 (*ibid.*, II, 294, 345, 542); also his remarks on the Confederation (*ibid.*, 552-558). Burke's defence of state sovereignty is somewhat more fully treated in the writer's article, "Southern Statesmen and the Confederation", in *North Carolina Historical Review*, October, 1937.

ever be supposed that the eagerness so manifest in Congress at York was animated solely by the ideal of unity for its own sake. At all times confederation was conceived of primarily as a means to a great end, and at this time in particular one of the impelling forces was the urgent need for foreign aid.

Came winter, and at Valley Forge the army, coatless and shoeless, shivered and froze. Came spring, and at York Congress—a remnant of it—still shivered and shook in its shoes. It was said that British peace commissioners were coming, but with what terms they would come, whether with the same old yoke or one less galling to American necks, no one yet knew. It was also known that American commissioners were endeavoring to negotiate a treaty of alliance with France, but whether they would succeed and how soon, Congress had not yet learned. Would the British commissioners arrive first, or would it be the French treaty? The future of the United States of America probably depended upon which of the two first approached the Congress chamber. While Congress wondered and waited, suddenly, on the 2nd of May, the treaty arrived. Then

Up from Earth's Centre through the Seventh Gate

rose the spirit of Congress—until it bethought itself of that unratified Confederation. Then did the wings of the Congressional spirit become iced, and down it dropped a thousand feet or more. However, they were a spunky little group that had stood by all that hard winter and spring, and they determined to put the Confederation through somehow, despite warm weather and high water back in the states. It would never do for the minister of France to come and find that they were not yet confederated. The states had proposed various and sundry alterations, for better or for worse; but Congress turned thumbs down on them all, good and bad alike, and besought the states for immediate and unconditional ratification. At some more convenient season Congress and the states would take counsel together respecting needful alterations.[17]

[17] A closer view of this phase of Congressional thought and activity is offered in the writer's paper, *Our Union of States in the Making* (Carnegie Institution of Washington, *Supplementary Publications*, no. 18; also in *World Affairs*, September, 1935).

In the past Congress had proved itself fairly successful as a high-powered salesman of its own wares; but this time three little states, Maryland, New Jersey and Delaware, plumped themselves right down in the middle of the Congress highway and refused to budge or take the bait until the states that made claim to large tracts of western lands should agree to a programme of share and share alike in these lands, a goodly part of which, averred the protestants, had been won by the blood and treasure of all of them anyway. By one means or another New Jersey and Delaware were soon prevailed on to relent, but Maryland put up a sales-resistance that lasted more than three years and gave Congress the run of its life. In fact, that state stood out stubbornly until she had obtained a sort of pledge of the division demanded, and even then, as Professor Sioussat has recently pointed out, she yielded only at the earnest solicitation of the minister of France.[18]

It was on the first day of March, 1781, that Maryland's ratification of the Articles took place, and thereupon Congress entered upon the second phase of its search for the formula of a "more perfect union". It is said that President Cleveland once uttered a lament that he had Congress on his hands. Strange as it may seem, though Congress could not but rejoice over the consummation of the Confederation, now it groaned aloud because it had the Articles of Confederation on its hands. For one thing, whereas hitherto Congress had had a large degree of freedom to wander at will—provided it did not wander too far—now it was restrained within the bounds of the Confederation, more than one of whose provisions galled the Congressional neck and wrung the Congressional withers. But most of all, Congress was tormented because the Articles fell short of the requirements of a self-sufficing government. In the interval between the formation of the Confederation and its final ratification Congress had had many trying experiences, many desperate struggles to carry on the war and to keep the government from collapsing. And herein lie many sad stories of the life and times of the Continental Congress, that can here be only vaguely hinted at. Let it

[18] St. George L. Sioussat, "The Chevalier de la Luzerne and the Ratification of the Articles of Confederation by Maryland, 1780-1781; with Accompanying Documents," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, October, 1936.

then suffice to say that, by the summer of 1779, the Revolutionary cause had sunk so low that the Congress of the Union had all but lost the consideration of the states and the respect of the people. It was in that year, it will be remembered, that the Continental finances utterly collapsed, with the result that Congress money not only lost its wonted power to soothe the ruffled bosom, its value sank to so fathomless a depth that "a Continental" became a synonym for utmost worthlessness, that worthlessness further emphasized by a small, explosive suffix. Thenceforth, Congress must needs wheedle every little dollar out of the states, and, though Congress became an eloquent wheedler, the states, on their part, in the hardness of their hearts and in the precariousness of their own finances, developed a like proficiency in hearkening not unto Congressional prayer. Indeed, such became the dearth of money that Congress perforce adopted the plan of calling for army supplies on the hoof and in the barrel. And thereby also hang some alluring tales.[19]

During the year 1780 numerous suggestions were offered, some from within Congress, some from without, looking toward an enlargement of the powers of Congress. Finally, such was the mood of desperation, some members even went so far as to propose that Congress should assume the requisite powers, although, in their moments of sober thought, they knew well enough that it behooved Congress in such matters to speak softly, to walk narrowly, to step precisely, and to avoid any and every appearance of usurpation.[20] Still, it can not be denied that Congress did have occasional attacks of megalomania, as well as of melancholia. And why not? Had not Congress fallen heir to a complete outfit of governmental para-

[19] One such story, which has dramatic as well as economic interest, and likewise has a direct bearing on the development of administration under Congress, is the episode of the Committee at Headquarters in the spring and summer of 1780. The episode is liberally documented in vol. V of the *Letters of Members* and receives further treatment in a special study, "Washington and Committees at Headquarters", in Am. Hist. Assoc., *Annual Report*, 1932, 103-119.

[20] Washington, and some members of Congress as well, were inclined to the view that Congress had forfeited, or "frittered away", powers which it might and ought to have made use of. See, for example, *Letters of Members*, V, 227. For the views of sundry members of Congress, see *ibid.*, 379, 478, 487, 491, 520, 526, 536, 537, 547, 551, 553, 584.

phernalia of a sort—executive, legislative, judicial, all rolled into one bundle? Suppose some of the garments were out of style; suppose some were misfits; suppose some scoffer, as he observed that assembly proudly trying on one or another of the garments, did mockingly jibe: "Congress is too big for its breeches". Was it therefore any fault of Congress? No; it was the fault of the breeches. Congress was yet young; it would grow. Had it not long been suffering from growing pains?

Nevertheless, for Congress to contemplate going into the dictator business was, all things considered, a somewhat startling portent. And yet, in this era of omens, portents and prodigies, still stranger things befel. Though the states had, almost without exception, shown reluctance if not downright refusal to comply with the requisitions of Congress, behold! some of them now came forward with the suggestion that Congress be authorized to use the military power to enforce its requisitions. The proposal was generated by or through a series of conventions of the Eastern states and first found its way to Philadelphia direct from the New York legislature—to Philadelphia, but not to Congress. For the New York delegates, when they read the proposal of their legislature, did straightway swallow down their spittle; then they hurriedly secreted the resolution where, they hoped, the eye of Congress would not fall upon it. But their secrecy was all in vain, for presently that precise proposition was laid before Congress by the convention recently assembled at Hartford.[21] Thereupon, both in Congress and in the outlying regions, wherever the echoes of that proposal resounded, fierce remonstrances were belched forth, and there arose exclamations of *anathema maranatha, sic semper tyrannis,* and other like explosions, with only here and there a feeble *e pluribus unum,* and not a single *In God We Trust.* The Reverend John Witherspoon, for instance, solemnly asseverated that he'd be dinged and dug up and dinged over again, or language to that effect, if he would vote for any such

[21] See, for instance, the letter of James Duane to Governor Clinton, November 14, 1780, *Letters of Members,* V, 444. A report on the proceedings of the Hartford Convention (laid before Congress on December 12, 1780) was presented on February 16, 1781, but the shocking proposal is not therein alluded to.

measure.[22] Nevertheless, as will presently be pointed out, the idea did take lodgment in some of the minds in Congress.

It was at such a time that an idea, which had a few times before knocked on the door of Congress, but had failed to obtain admittance, again appeared on the scene. This was the proposal that a special convention be called together, either thoroughly to overhaul the Articles of Confederation or to formulate an entirely new constitution. Once more the idea failed to gain admittance, yet the day was to come when it would be the guest of honor. Or, to borrow the language of a famous Book, the stone which the builders had rejected would in time become the head of the corner.

Out of all this welter Congress had evolved, by February 3, 1781, a resolution to call upon the states for a grant of power to levy and collect an impost whereby Congress might at least obtain its own pocket money. This request was sent out to the states at the moment when Congress, and many more besides, were thrilled by the news that Maryland had at last decided to ratify the Articles of Confederation. The result of the application to the states would not however be known for many months—it proved to be nearly two years—meanwhile Satan and Company would be presenting many overdue bills against the United States in Congress Assembled —and the Devil was known to be a good bill-collector.

Accordingly, immediately following the Maryland ratification a committee was appointed to prepare a plan to invest Congress " with full and explicit powers for effectually carrying into execution in the several states all acts or resolutions passed agreeably to the Articles of Confederation ". The report of that committee, which, by the way, included one James Madison, contained two opinions and one proposition.[23] Opinion number one was, that the thirteenth

[22] The remarks of Witherspoon alluded to are in a letter to Governor William Livingston, December 16, 1780, *ibid.*, V, 487. See also the remarks of James Warren, *ibid.*, 488 n. Other reactions toward these conventions and the propositions that emanated from them are found *ibid.*, 347, 352, 379, 392, 445 n., 491, 504.

[23] The committee, appointed March 6, 1781, was Varnum of Rhode Island, Duane of New York, and Madison of Virginia. The report, drawn principally by Madison, was presented on March 12, but was not taken into consideration until May 2, under which date it is found in the *Journals*. It was

article appeared to contain an implied power in Congress to enforce every provision of the Confederation. Opinion number two was that, notwithstanding this, "all exercise of power should be explicitly and precisely warranted". In this manner did a committee of the old Congress stage the prologue to the great controversy between John Marshall and Thomas Jefferson. The proposition was that there be an amendment to the Confederation authorizing Congress to employ the land and sea forces to compel a delinquent state to fulfil its federal obligations. As was much the practice of Congress, this business was sifted through two other committees. The result of the first sifting was that Congress should have power to lay embargoes in time of war. When the third committee had resifted the debris of its two predecessors—and much scrapings besides—it found seven grains of something or other in its sifter, the largest of which was a power in Congress to distrain the property of a state which became delinquent in its assignments of men and money. Congress gave a glance at the exhibit, emitted one quick snort, and lo! nothing was left. The report of this last committee has, nevertheless, a certain value, for the reason that the committee offered a sort of outline of what, in its opinion, the constitution of the union should embody, anticipating numerous provisions of the Constitution which was afterward formed.[24]

on this same March 6 that John Sullivan wrote to Washington: "I fully agree with your Excellency That Congress ought to have more power but I also think that the old Members should be in Heaven or at Home before this takes place" (*Letters of Members*, VI, 12). See also James M. Varnum to Governor Greene, March 16 (*ibid.*, 28), and Madison to Jefferson, April 16 (*ibid.*, 59; *Writings*, ed. Hunt, I, 129).

[24] The first committee's report was referred to a grand committee (consisting of one member from each state), who submitted their report July 20. The third committee (Randolph of Virginia, Ellsworth of Connecticut, and Varnum of Rhode Island) brought in a report on August 22 (it is found in the *Journals* under that date), the first part of which is an enumeration of the particulars in which the Confederation "requires execution"—a list of twenty-one specifications. The second part contains observations and recommendations; among the former, that "a general Council is a necessary organ" for the Republic, and that "without the extension of its power in the cases hereinafter enumerated War may receive a fatal inclination and peace be exposed to daily convulsion"; among the latter, besides that mentioned in the text, that Congress be authorized to lay embargoes in time of war, without any

What it here behooves us especially to take note of is that, in dallying with this idea of employing force against a delinquent state, Congress was tackling one of the knottiest problems that bedeviled the Federal Convention. It was by no means the last time that the idea made its appearance in Congress, and the Federal Convention did a great deal of thinking before it arrived at the solution of the problem—direct action of government upon individuals, instead of coercion of states.

For our present purpose we may, without serious mishap, go forward to the spring of 1783, pausing only to peep in on Congress about December, 1782, when it learned that Rhode Island had flatly refused to accede to the impost measure of February, 1781. Confronted by the action of Rhode Island Congress did not need to nurse its wrath to keep it warm. On the contrary, the Congressional wrath remained at a high temperature the whole winter through. Up to mid-April, however, Congress had not been able to conclude upon any better method of obtaining the needful powers than by making a second trial of the impost device, although it now offered the measure in a somewhat diluted form. That proposal, likewise, ultimately went down to defeat (this time at the hands of New York), but by then (1786) the Federal Convention was glimpsed just over the horizon.

It was during the discussion of this measure in Congress however that, for at least the fourth time,[25] the idea of a constitutional convention knocked at the door of Congress, and actually for a moment thrust its head inside. Time will not permit us to trace through all its ramifications this concept of a constitutional convention, a concept which is, in fact, inherent in the theory of the social compact;

limitation. Finally, the committee recommended that a committee be appointed "to prepare a representation to the several States of the necessity of these supplemental powers". The report was made "an order of the day for to Morrow"; but, so far as this report was concerned, tomorrow never came. Congress did, however, on November 2, make a request of the states in conformity to one of the last committee's recommendations, namely, that taxes laid by the states for the payment of their quotas be an item separate from taxes for state purposes and be paid into the hands of federal collectors.

[25] That is, instances in which a constitutional convention was specifically recommended. There were numerous other approaches toward the plan.

yet it does seem pertinent to take note of its several appearances in Congress. One of the earliest instances in which the idea might well have entered the thoughts of members of Congress was when Thomas Paine, in his pamphlet *Common Sense,* counseled the colonies: "Let a continental conference be held . . . to frame a Continental Charter, or Charter of the United Colonies".[26] But the noise Paine was making about independence doubtless drowned out this passing suggestion. Then, in August, 1776, when Congress was struggling with the problem of setting up a "form of a Confederation", Edward Rutledge of South Carolina wrote:

> If my opinion was likely to be taken, I would propose that the states should appoint a special Congress to be composed of new members for this purpose—and that no Person should disclose any part of the present plan.[27]

Some three years later, when Congress was desperately striving to find its way out of the gloom which encompassed it, another South Carolinian, Henry Laurens, set forth in some letters a similar suggestion, and, in a letter written while the Federal Convention was sitting, he declared that it was just such a convention that he had proposed in Congress in 1779.[28] The next definite appearance of the idea upon the scene, in the autumn of 1780, has already been alluded to. Its advent at that time was through a letter of Alexander Hamilton, who was not then a member of Congress, to James Duane of New York, who was a member. A number of the weightiest members of Congress were favorable to the plan, but the majority appear to have shied away from it.[29] Hamilton

[26] William M. Van der Weyde, *Life and Works of Thomas Paine* (New Rochelle, N. Y., 1925), II, 145 *et seq.*

[27] Rutledge to Robert R. Livingston, *Letters of Members,* II, 56.

[28] See Laurens to Governor Livingston of New Jersey, July 5, 1779, and Laurens to John Adams, October 4, 1779, *ibid.,* IV, 298, 467. On July 13, 1787, Laurens wrote to John Vaughan of London: "The federal convention which you seem to allude to, tho' not then existing, I moved for in Congress in 1779, had such an Assembly been convened at that time, I am persuaded valuable Effects would have been produced by their deliberations. We are now rather late, and much up-hill work to be performed nevertheless I entertain good hopes." South Carolina Historical Society, Laurens Papers, vol. 13.

[29] See, for instance, John Sullivan to President Weare of New Hampshire, October 2, 1780 (*Letters of Members,* V, 397); also James M. Varnum to Gov-

however held fast to his purpose to press the plan upon the country, and in 1782, in conjunction with Philip Schuyler, he prevailed upon the New York legislature to send to Congress a definite suggestion that a constitutional convention be convened.[30] However, Congress was still in a hesitant mood, partly because the outcome of the impost measure of February, 1781, was as yet in doubt; so that, for the time being, nothing came of the proposal.

In November, 1782, Hamilton himself became a member of Congress. He evidently took pains to foster the plan of a convention amongst the members, and, in January, 1783, he wrote to Governor Clinton that many of the most sensible men acknowledged the wisdom of the measure. Then, in April, when a discussion of the idea in the large arose in Congress, Hamilton stated that, in obedience to instructions from his constituents, he would presently offer a plan.[31] Such a plan, generally supposed to have been drawn up by Hamilton at Princeton sometime later, exists, but it was never presented.[32] Hamilton has recorded that it was for lack of support; but there was another potent reason.

ernor Greene of Rhode Island, April 2, 1781 (*ibid.*, VI, 42). Hamilton's letter to James Duane, dated September 3, 1780, from which it has sometimes been supposed that the whole idea of a constitutional convention stemmed, is in Hamilton's *Works* (ed. J. C. Hamilton), I, 150-168; (ed. Lodge, 1904 edition), I, 213-239. In the summer of 1781 (resumed in the summer of 1782 after a period of suspension) Hamilton, as "The Continentalist", further elaborated his thoughts (*Works*, ed. Lodge, 1, 243 *et seq.*).

[30] See Duane to Schuyler, August 16, 1782, to Governor Clinton, August 20, Ezra L'Hommedieu to Clinton, September 11, and John T. Gilman to Josiah Bartlett, September 17 (*Letters of Members*, VI, 445, 449, 471, 473).

[31] See Hamilton to Clinton, January 12, 1783; Stephen Higginson to Theophilus Parsons, April 7 (*ibid.*, VII, 13, 122), and Higginson to General Knox, February 8, 1787 (*ibid.*, 123 n.); also Madison's *Notes of Debates*, April 1, 1783 (*Journals*, XXV, 951-952; *Writings*, ed. Hunt, I, 438).

[32] The document is in the Library of Congress, Hamilton Papers, and bears Hamilton's endorsement, "Resolutions intended to be submitted at Princeton in 1783; but abandoned for want of support". Another hand has endorsed it with the date "June 30, 1783", and that date is given it in the printed texts (*Works*, ed. J. C. Hamilton, II, 269-275; ed. Lodge, I, 305-314). The date was probably assigned to it because that was the day Congress first met at Princeton, but the composition probably belongs to an earlier date. See Hamilton to Washington, September 30, 1783 (*Works*, ed. J. C. Hamilton, I, 402; ed. Lodge, IX, 385). A committee report of September 2, 1783,

In June, 1783, occurred the so-called mutiny of Pennsylvania troops, in consequence of which Congress for a third time decamped from Philadelphia, this time never more to return, though Philadelphia burned untold quantities of incense under the Congressional nostrils, though that city held out enticing "Sugar Plums" in unstinted measure, even honey in the honey comb.[33] Congress, that froward hussy, despite the hankering of some of its members to enjoy the pleasure of Philadelphia for yet one more season, chose rather to roam the desert for any number of blue moons. And thus it came to pass that Congress wandered from one little oasis to another—Princeton, Annapolis, Trenton and lastly New York; and, though the members of Congress ever and anon turned eager eyes and yearning hearts toward that Mount Sinai of their hopes, a more perfect union, it was long before they again made serious attempts to scale its heights.

Some agitation there was in the autumn of 1784 and the winter of 1785 of the question of entrusting the problem to a constitutional convention, but for some reason not fully revealed, the agitation once more faded into silence.[34] Then, in the summer of the latter year, the Massachusetts legislature, at the instance of Governor Bowdoin, sent a message to Congress urging the convention method of solution. But, just as the New York delegates had done in a similar case in an earlier period, the Massachusetts delegates, in their wisdom, or lack of it, chose to withhold the recommendation from Congress, and thereafter they succeeded in persuading their legislature to rescind the recommendation.[35] Notwithstanding all these cross purposes and confusion of tongues, early in 1786, at a time when it could not as yet be foreseen whether the projected

recommended the postponement of further consideration of the New York proposal, awaiting the result of the application to the states (April 18) for a grant of power to levy imposts.

[33] These characterizations of the Philadelphia offerings are borrowed from one of Pennsylvania's own delegates, Richard Peters. See *Letters of Members*, VII, 217, 234; also letters of Dr. Benjamin Rush, July 2, 4, 12, September 30 (*ibid.*, 201 n., 205 n., 217 n., 371 n.), and John Montgomery to Rush, July 8 (*ibid.*, 215).

[34] See *Letters of Members*, VII, 615, 616, 638; VIII, 66 n.

[35] See *Letters of Members*, VIII, 189, 207-210, 218, 219, 245.

Annapolis Convention would accomplish its own purposes or any other, once more some of the leading men in Congress began to press for the calling of a constitutional convention.[36]

In March of that year, for instance, when New Jersey mounted the old gray mare and threatened to ride off into the wilderness (which, being interpreted, is to say, when New Jersey practically threw down the gantlet to Congress by refusing further compliance with the requisitions of that body until New York had ceased to levy taxes on importations into New Jersey through the port of New York), Congress sent a committee to Trenton to persuade the New Jersey legislature to rescind its act. Of that committee was Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, and in his speech to the legislature he declared that New Jersey

> ought immediately to instruct her delegates in congress to urge the calling of a general convention of the states, for the purpose of revising and amending the federal system. . . . I have long been of opinion [said he] that it was the only true and radical remedy for our public defects.[37]

In the beginning of May Pinckney proceeded to inaugurate directly in Congress a campaign for a constitutional convention, addressing that body in a speech which David Ramsay characterized as "some of the best reasoning and most elegant speaking I have ever heard in my life".[38] What might have come of this

[36] *Ibid.*, 293, 324, 333, 350, 351, 367, 374.

[37] Pinckney's speech (March 13) is *ibid.*, 321-330. See also the purported extract of Grayson's speech, 330 n. See also *ibid.*, 315, 318, 319, 330-334. For the proceedings in Congress, see the *Journals*, March 6-8, 22.

[38] See *Letters of Members*, VIII, 350, 351, 373, 374, 399. The consideration of the question was delayed because of the thinness of representation. See James Manning of Rhode Island to Governor Collins, May 26 (*ibid.*, 367). Another Rhode Island member, not then at Congerss but energetically trying to obtain money from his government to pay his expenses thither, points oddly to the recalcitrancy of his state: "I think i find a Disposition in many of our new faces in the Legislature to not send any Members to Congress, but they are small men, they Have Heads and so has board Nailes" (*ibid.*, 368). On July 5, a grand committee was appointed "to report such amendments to the Confederation and a draft of such resolutions as it may be necessary to recommend to the several states for the purpose of obtaining from them such powers as will render the federal government adequate to

movement initiated by Pinckney, had not the Annapolis Convention, with its possibilities and its hopes, now drawn the attention of Congress, can only be conjectured.

How the Annapolis Convention impinged upon Congress, which is a story of parts in its own right, can not be related here except in the most summary fashion. Its immediate purpose was to bring to convergence the forces gathering about two commercial problems, a specific problem which had arisen between two states, Virginia and Maryland, but with implications for some others, and the more general problem of federal control of the commerce of all the states, whether inter-state or foreign. The inevitable question was whether this convergence of forces would have a result which was both harmonious and beneficent, or would only aggravate existing antagonisms. The chief promoter of the Annapolis Convention, James Madison, despite his fears of the latter result, built his hopes upon the former. Indeed, his hopes, though hesitant, went further and visioned the possibility of a reform of the Confederation such as would be "of a permanent not a temporary nature".[39]

At that moment one of the most formidable obstacles to permanent reform, such as was hoped for by those who were advocating a constitutional convention, was the separatist impulse that had for sometime been gathering force, particularly among the Eastern states. Not only had the conviction begun to take strong hold upon the minds of the Eastern statesmen that the interests of the East and the South were mutually antagonistic, they appear to have gone so far as to lay plans for a separate Eastern confederation.

the ends for which it was instituted". The report of that committee (in the *Journals*, August 7), is the last serious effort to reform the Confederation by means of amendments. Indeed it may represent the wishes rather than the expectations of the committee. What Congress as a whole may have thought of it is largely left to conjecture, for, though a day (August 14) was assigned for its consideration, there is no record that it was ever debated. See *Letters of Members*, VIII, 433, 455, 462, 471. Concerning the report itself, see Bancroft, *Formation of the Constitution*, 260-263; Charles Warren, *Making of the Constitution* (1937 ed.), 20-23; A. C. McLaughlin, *Constitutional History of the United States*, 144-145.

[39] Madison to Monroe, March 19, 1786 (*Writings*, ed. Hunt, II, 231; see also *Letters of Members*, VIII, 307 n.). The reaction in Congress both to the Annapolis Convention and to the Federal Convention, can be readily followed by means of the index to the volume last cited.

Furthermore, notwithstanding the recognized deficiences of the Confederation, notwithstanding the unbroken series of failures to rectify those deficiencies through the agency of Congress, a good many of these statesmen had taken refuge in the doctrine that, even though the Articles of Confederation were not sacrosanct, Congress was the anointed of the states and their union, and only from its hand could be obtained the blessing of a more perfect union.

Accordingly, not only did some members of Congress voice grave doubts of the efficacy of the Annapolis Convention before it assembled, they gave vent to sneers at its futility afterward. As for the Constitutional Convention proposed by the truncated Annapolis gathering as the sole hope of perpetuating the union, that likewise these same men for a time looked at askance or pronounced upon it outright condemnation. So deep was their distrust that they yielded to the proposition with reluctance and set about tying the hands of the Convention with bonds which, they believed, would restrain that body within the strictly limited bounds of amendment to the Articles of Confederation.

It is to the credit of one of these men in particular, Rufus King, that, though he came to scoff, he remained to praise, and in the end joined with might and main, with heart and soul, in the task of laying well the foundations of our constitutional structure and of promoting the cause of a union of whose virtues he had formerly harbored serious doubts. Time was to bring into the fold many another sinner who had loudly scoffed, and to silence the voices of those who had contemptuously sneered.

The story of the reaction of Congress toward the resultant labors of the Federal Convention is similar, although for the new contest now staged there was a new line-up of players. Permit me once again to point to those accumulations of historical flotsam that are to be observed encumbering the surface of our national life-stream. There is a rather persistent notion that the Federal Convention thrust its finished work into the face of Congress with a defiant gesture, and that, with a like gesture, Congress all but pronounced anathema upon it in good set terms. There is a measure of truth in these charges, but they are far from constituting the whole truth and nothing but the truth. The Federal Convention, for its part,

knew well enough that it had in a sense departed from the strict letter of the Congressional injunction, but, having respect unto the proverb, "A soft answer turneth away wrath; but grievous words stir up anger", skilfully cushioned the possible jolt to Congress. As for Congress, in whose multiple and complex mind still lingered the memory of a time when it was accounted "august", that body does indeed at first glance appear to have been strangely hesitant to espouse that very way of salvation which it had ofttimes been almost persuaded to embrace. That appearance, however, is derived from the fact that a militant and blatant minority would fain have spat defiance at the proposed Constitution. Yet, though they clamored with voices both loud and shrill, they found it beyond their power to make their combined voice the voice of Congress. The potency of their leaven did not suffice to leaven the whole lump; all they effected was to modify slightly the process of kneading the dough.

From the beginning, as I have endeavored to point out, Congress was composed of diverse, even antagonistic elements. There were at all stages men who saw but dimly if aught beyond the boundaries of their own commonwealths, some of them, indeed, scarcely beyond the borders of their home towns. But there were likewise men who lifted their eyes to the far horizon and believed in the visions which they saw there. And, though the former often had the majority of voices, it was the latter who, through the long stretch of years, chiefly gave to the proceedings of Congress their fundamental tone and to Congress itself its most enduring character. If, then, there be any who are disposed to harbor thoughts of the Old Congress as plenteous in talk and prone to quarrelsomeness, but slow to act and slower still to reason, I venture to offer one gentle admonition: More than all other forces combined, the experiences of the Continental Congress quickened the reasoning of the Federal Convention.

In this rapid sketch I have endeavored mainly to point out that our national drama did not, as many seem prone to think, begin only with the scene enacted in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787; but that the drama then begun had its prologue, a prologue which itself is one of the great dramas of human history. Further, I

would emphasize the thought that without a comprehension of the prologue the full significance of the larger drama can not be adequately grasped.

It may very well be that the actors in that prologue did sometimes strut a bit in their stride across the stage; it may be that the Old Congress was both a downright and a forthright sinner, that it ofttimes did those things which it should not have done and left undone the things it should have done, so that at times hopes for its eternal salvation grew thin and faint; yet there was never a time when there was not at least a modicum of health in the old body, nor did it dwell forever in the bonds of iniquity. Whatever may have been its sins, we should at least offer up a prayer of thanksgiving that, in the gloomiest period of our national history, a period when the fate of the new nation hung delicately in the balance, when the spirit of disunion stalked over the land as a pestilence at noonday, a faithful few in the Old Congress, holding fast to the faith that from this imperfect would in the fullness of time come a more perfect union, were resolved that the ideal of a united America should not be allowed to perish. The future they saw but as through a glass darkly, yet they quenched not the spirit, they held fast to that which was good, they continued to hope for that they saw not. If, then, there be a heaven to which old Congresses go in the last days, surely for that old Congress called Continental there must be laid up a crown whereon is at least one star, a star with thirteen points.

EDMUND CODY BURNETT.

THE CHILDREN'S CRUSADE

In the spring of the year 1212 began that most curious of all the Crusades, the Crusade of the Children.[1] Its story, filled with human interest for the modern reader, had not so great an appeal for contemporary writers and, consequently, remains clouded in obscurity. Truly, we cannot help but be impressed by the lack of a proper sense of news value on the part of the mediaeval chroniclers and annalists as we read their accounts of the events with which they came in contact. The present paper will attempt to reconstruct the history of this movement from the available sources.

The rising of the children began sometime between Easter and Pentecost.[2] It appears to have been very widespread, affecting northern France, Flanders and western Germany. For some districts there is fairly detailed information while in other cases there

[1] A further addition to the comparatively extensive literature of this interesting subject can scarcely be presented without a few words of explanation. The fact of the matter is that among the secondary works dealing with the topic there are very few that merit serious consideration. The historical episode has always been quite intriguing to lovers of legend and has even served as a basis for playlets intended for performance by Sunday school groups, for example, S. E. Woodbridge, *Crusade of the Children* (Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, Committee on Religious Drama, 1924). Eliminating the works that fall into such categories, all that remain are: Alfred des Essarts, "La croisade des enfants (1213)", in *Deux croisades au moyen âge* (Paris, 1862); George Zabriskie Gray, *The Children's Crusade* (second edition, Boston, 1898); Dana C. Munro, "The Children's Crusade", *American Historical Review*, xix (1914); and R. Röhricht, "Der Kinderkreuzzug, 1212", *Historische Zeitschrift*, xxxvi (1876). The first of these deals almost exclusively with the French phase of the movement. Gray does not even pretend to be an historian; his work exhibits his vivid imagination but very few facts. Röhricht fails to distinguish clearly between the facts and the legends. Munro alone makes a scholarly approach to the subject, but even he does not seem to be at his best in this article. The present author, having become interested in the subject recently and having consulted all the available sources, found himself drawn to different conclusions from those set forth by the previous writers. On this account he determined to reconstruct the entire story exclusively from the sources, and the results of his independent research are now first offered to the public.

[2] "Chronicae Regiae Coloniensis Continuatio Prima", *MGSS*, XXIV, 17-18.

is only a bare suggestion. However, before proceeding with the narrative of the Crusade, some attention must be given to the problem of motivation. In the first place, the attribution of its leadership to Stephen and Nicholas—the only members of all the groups whose names have come down to us—seems to place too great a burden upon twelve-year-old boys. The story of its origination by agents of the Old Man of the Mountain, the leader of the Assassins, is too fantastic an explanation to merit serious consideration.[3] Furthermore, its allocation to divine[4] or diabolical[5] influence requires proof which those who thus viewed it lacked. Viewed in its proper perspective, which naturally necessitates its projection upon the background of the times, it appears to have been a manifestation of a psychological reaction to contemporary events. It must be borne in mind that the period under consideration which shortly followed that great fiasco, the Fourth Crusade, was witnessing the Albigensian Crusade, both of which movements presented to the eyes of many only a picture of Christians warring upon Christians while the Holy Places remained in the hands of the infidel.

The first unusual movement of children in the year 1212, about which there is any definite account,[6] is that led by Stephen, a shepherd boy of Cloyes, in the month of June. (There were probably sporadic outbreaks in many regions earlier than this, but the majority of the chronicles and annals give no clue whatever to the approximate dates at which they occurred.) Stephen claimed that Our Lord had appeared to him in the guise of a poor pilgrim and had given him letters to be brought to the King of France. Accordingly, having gathered a considerable multitude of other young shepherds, he set out for St. Denis. There, apparently, the move-

[3] The earliest mention of this appears to be in the passage written in the margin of MS. Gale of the *Annals* of Walter of Coventry. It was copied by the *Chronicle of Lanercost* and by Vincent of Beauvais.

[4] Cf. "Annales Colonienses Maximi", *MGSS*, XVII, 826-827; "Annales Marbacenses", *MGSS*, XVII, 172.

[5] Cf. "Annales Austriae — Continuatio Admuntensis", *MGSS*, IX, 592; "Matthaei Parisiensis Chronica Majora", *RS*, II, 558.

[6] "Chronicon Anonymi Laudunensis Canonici", *Bouquet, Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France* (Paris, 1868-80, ed. L. Delisle), XVIII, 715.

ment came to the king's attention, for he shortly consulted the masters at Paris for advice as to what action he should take with regard to it. Upon their recommendation he ordered the boys to return home and the chronicler leaves no room for doubt but that they obeyed the royal command.[7] It is especially to be noted that in this account no mention whatever is made of the purpose of the gathering. From the general trend of the story (as presented in this version) is seems to be quite justifiable to identify the pilgrimage under discussion with the processions which were being conducted in all parts of France at the time as pious demonstrations against the continued occupation of the Holy Places by the Saracens.[8] No doubt because of the proximity of the rather obscure village of Cloyes to the much more widely known town of Vendôme, a later annalist[9] was led to the error of making the latter place the point of origin of the movement, an error which was copied by others.[10] It remained for a chronicler writing a generation later and far removed from the scene of action to confuse this gathering with the Children's Crusade.[11]

From Sens comes an entirely different story.[12] Here is one of the points of origin of the real Children's Crusade. Indeed, the group which set out from this place was probably the nucleus of the French contingent in that expedition. This may be inferred from the fact that most of the French chroniclers and annalists[13] who

[7] "Sicque puerilis illa devotio, sicut fuit de facili inchoata, ita fuit de facili terminata." *Ibid.* This is the only source which mentions Stephen of Cloyes by name.

[8] "Chronicon Coenobii Mortui-Maris", *Bouquet*, XVIII, 355; "Chronica Monasterii Sancti Bertini Auctore Iohanne Longo De Ipra", *MGSS*, XXV, 828. The former is copied almost verbally in "Annalium Rotomagensium Continuationes", *MGSS*, XXVI, 501.

[9] "Annales Gemmeticenses", *MGSS*, XXVI, 510.

[10] "Anonymi Continuatio Appendicis Roberti de Monte ad Sigebertum", *Bouquet*, XVIII, 344; "Chronicon Savigniacensis Monasterii", *Bouquet*, XVIII, 351.

[11] "Chronica Albrici Monachi Trium Fontium", *MGSS*, XXIII, 893-894.

[12] "Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae", *MGSS*, XXV, 301.

[13] *e. g.*: "Chronicon Anonymi Laudunensis Canonici" *Bouquet*, XVIII, 715; "Chronicon Coenobii Mortui-Maris", *Bouquet*, XVIII, 355; "Annalium Rotomagensium Continuationes", *MGSS*, XXVI, 501; "Annales Gemmeti-

mention the children at all refer to the movement dealt with in the preceding paragraph and the further fact that the few French sources[14] which are concerned with the true Crusade all connect very well geographically for the tentative establishment of the route which the young crusaders followed. Before continuing any further along these lines, however, a word must be said concerning the reliability of Alberic of Troisfontaines. As already mentioned,[15] he confuses the processions to St. Denis with the Children's Crusade, but this was due no doubt to the survival of two separate traditions which he attempted to reconcile. It is logical to believe that, when the story of the later adventures and misadventures of the children was related to him, it recalled to his mind the tradition of the earlier movement and also that of the passage of the crusaders through the district in which his monastery was located. His garbled version of these two traditions which for scholarly purposes is worthless serves as an introduction to the main narrative which deals with the later events and which is of the greatest importance. It is evident to anyone who reads Alberic's *Chronicle* that these two parts are independent in origin and may be separately evaluated. In the latter part, if the overcredulousness of the author be taken into consideration, the main elements of the account may be accepted particularly since the statements which can be checked by other evidence are substantially correct.[16]

The children who departed from Sens formed a considerable gathering; there were both boys and girls who had come from various districts in that vicinity.[17] They announced it to be their

censes", *MGSS*, XXVI, 510: "Anonymi Continuatio Appendicis Roberti de Monte ad Sigebertum", *Bouquet*, XVIII, 344; "Chronicon Savigniacensis Monasterii", *Bouquet*, XVIII, 351.

[14] "Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae", *MGSS*, XXV, 301; "Chronica Albrici Monachi Trium Fontium", *MGSS*, XXIII, 893-894; "Reineri ad Sanctum Jacobum Monachi Chronicon Leodiensi", *Bouquet*, XVIII, 623.

[15] *Supra*, 32, n. 11.

[16] *E. g.*, the story of the foundation of the Church of the New Innocents by Pope Gregory IX. The ruins of this edifice were discovered by Newton Perkins in 1867. Cf. George Z. Gray, *The Children's Crusade* (second edition), Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin Company, 1898, Appendix B.

[17] "Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae", *MGSS*, XXV, 301.

intention to cross over to the Holy Land which was to be given into their possession just as it had in days of old been granted to the children of Israel after their escape from Egypt. Apparently they had heard the call from Cologne, for thither they wended their way. The best route, and it is the one they seem to have used, is that followed by the modern railroad line from Sens to Troyes and thence to Châlons. From the latter district [18] comes the account of Alberic which seems to indicate their passage through that region.[19] Eventually it appears that they reached the valley of the Meuse which they followed to Liège. From the arrangement of the entry for the year 1212 in the *Chronicle* [20] of the last-mentioned city, it may be assumed that the crusaders passed there sometime about July 1st. From there they proceeded to join the assembling multitudes at Cologne.

It must have been about the middle of July that the departure of the Crusade from Cologne took place. The young crusaders were organized into bands of twenty, fifty or a hundred,[21] and traveled thus on their journey. However, all seem to have accepted the supreme authority of a certain German boy, Nicholas by name,[22] to whom is given the credit for the whole organization of the Crusade, but about whom, unfortunately, scarcely anything is known. The Rhine valley was followed through Mainz; [23] Speyer

[18] Troisfontaines is in the diocese of Châlons.

[19] This may be inferred from the fact that the monastic chroniclers generally interest themselves mainly with events which affected their own monasteries. Alberic's account is of such length that we must believe that the events related peculiarly concerned Troisfontaines. It is just possible that the children on their journey stopped there for rest and refreshment.

[20] "Reineri ad Sanctum Jacobum Monachi Chronicon Leodiense", *Bouquet*, XVIII, 623.

[21] "Chronicae Regiae Coloniensis Continuatio Prima", *MGSS*, XXIV, 17-18.

[22] "Gestorum Treverorum Continuatio Quarta", *MGSS*, XXIV, 398-399; "Chronicon Ebersheimense", *MGSS*, XXIII, 450; "Annales Austriae-Continuatio Admuntensis", MGSS, IX, 592; "Annales Placentini Guelfi", *MGSS*, XVIII, 426; "Ogerii Panis Annales Genuenses", *Muratori*, VI, 403; "Chronica de Civitate Januensi edita a Fratre Jacobo de Varagine", *Muratori*, IX, 45-46; "Annales Scheftlarienses Maiores", *MGSS*, XVII, 338; "Annales Montis Sancti Georgii", *MGSS*, XXX, I, 721.

[23] "Chronicae Regiae Coloniensis Continuatio Prima", *MGSS*, XXIV, 17-18.

was reached on July 25th.[24] Thence the children continued, still holding close to the Rhine, past Strassburg,[25] and eventually to the vicinity of the Lake of Constance.[26] There they disappear from sight for a time, but it seems a plausible conjecture that they crossed to the valley of the Inn which they followed to Innsbruck from which point they proceeded by the Brenner Pass into Italy continuing along the valley of the Adige and around Lake Garda to Cremona [27] where they return to view. On Monday, August 20th, the young crusaders passed through Piacenza [28] and by the following Saturday they had reached Genoa.[29]

The very method of organization of the Crusade militated against any real unity of direction. As early in the march as the arrival at Mainz,[30] some of the groups which has set out from Cologne abandoned the expedition and returned home. Many of those who persevered in their determination to follow the way of the crusader perished from heat, hunger or thirst before they ever reached Italy.[31] It is only natural to assume that, as the trials became greater, the defections increased in proportion. However, it seems that all who remained firm in their purpose kept together at least until they had arrived in Italy and quite likely until they had come to Genoa. But on the very day after their arrival at the latter place [32] they found themselves forced to leave by the request of the Genoese. The natives of the city could see no other course of action open to them since at the time they were supporting the cause of the Pope against the Emperor [33] and feared to allow such a large

[24] "Annales Spirenses", *MGSS*, XVII, 84.

[25] "Ellenhardi Argentinensis Annales", *MGSS*, XVII, 101. Cf. "Annales Marbacenses", *MGSS*, XVII, 172, and "Chronicon Ebersheimense", *MGSS*, XXIII, 450. Marbach and Ebersmünster are in the diocese of Strassburg.

[26] "Annales Zwifaltenses—Annales Maiores", *MGSS*, X, 58. Zwiefalten is in the diocese of Constance.

[27] "Sicardi Episcopi Cremonensis Chronicon", *Muratori*, VII, 624.

[28] "Annales Placentini Guelfi", *MGSS*, XVIII, 426.

[29] "Ogerii Panis Annales Genuenses", *Muratori*, VI, 403.

[30] "Chronicae Regiae Coloniensis Continuatio Prima", *MGSS*, XXIV, 17-18.

[31] "Annales Colonienses Maximi", *MGSS*, XVII, 826-827.

[32] "Ogerii Panis Annales Genuenses", *Muratori*, VI, 403.

[33] "Chronica de Civitate Januensi edita a Fratre Jacobo de Varagine", *Muratori*, IX, 45-46.

body of Germans, albeit the majority of them were children, to remain in the city because their motives might be construed wrongly and an interdict might result. Here the Crusade began to disintegrate; the children had been led to believe that, when they reached the sea, a path was to be miraculously opened through it for them, as formerly such a miracle had aided the Israelites, so that they might march directly to the Holy Land,[34] and now, disappointed in this, they could not stand the crushing blow of eviction from the city. Many of the crusaders remained in Genoa [35] as servants of the natives,[36] more than likely preferring to stay there in servitude rather than risking the dangers of the journey homeward. But others undertook the painful journey and returned sad and discouraged and accompanied by the jeers of the populace.[37]

Some of the youthful enthusiasts, still determined to get to the Holy Land and undismayed by their setback at Genoa, decided that they would after all need ships to take them across the sea [38] and, accordingly, in small groups they began to approach various ports in search of transportation. A number of them came to Pisa [39] and apparently sailed thence in two ships,[40] but the fate of this expedition is unknown, although it gives rise to an interesting conjecture that it may have reached its destination based on the appearance of Nicholas shortly after at Acre and at the siege of Damietta.[41] One of the sources [42] asserts that the children reached

[34] "Chronicon Ebersheimense", *MGSS*, XXIII, 450; "Sicardi Episcopi Cremonensis Chronicon", *Muratori*, VII, 624; "Annales Scheftlarienses Maiores", *MGSS*, XVII, 338; Chronica de Civitate Januensi edita a Fratre Jacobo de Varagine". *Muratori*, IX, 45-46.

[35] "Ogerii Panis Annales Genuenses", *Muratori*, VI, 403.

[36] "Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae", *MGSS*, XXV, 301; "Annales Marbacenses", *MGSS*, XVII, 172.

[37] "Annales Alberti Abbatis Stadensis", *MGSS*, XVI, 355; "Annales Marbacenses", *MGSS*, XVII, 172.

[38] "Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae", *MGSS*, XXV, 301; "Chronica Albrici Monachi Trium Fontium", *MGSS*, XXIII, 893-894.

[39] "Richeri Gesta Senoniensis Ecclesiae", *MGSS*, XXV, 301.

[40] The chronicle is not explicit on the point of departure but seems to indicate Pisa.

[41] "Annales Austriae—Continuatio Admuntensis", *MGSS*, IX, 592.

[42] "Gestorum Treverorum Continuatio Quarta", *MGSS*, XXIV, 398-399.

Brindisi, at which point they were turned back by the bishop who refused to permit them to sail from there for the Holy Land, but it is not likely that they proceeded as far as Brindisi in the light of the more reliable account of their dismissal from Rome.[43] At the latter place the Pope absolved those who had come thither of their crusading vow on condition that they should again take the Cross when they should come of age excepting only those who were at the time too young to know the true meaning of the vow and the elderly people who had come along with them.[44] A considerable portion of the crusaders who had been evicted from Genoa set out in the opposite direction from those whose wanderings have already been traced and eventually came to Marseilles.[45]

For the later adventures of those who reached Marseilles there is but one authority.[46] By him it is told that two merchants of that city, Hugo Ferreus and Guilelmus Porcus, offered to bring the children across the sea in their ships without remuneration as their contribution to the Holy Cause. Accordingly, they prepared seven large ships and, after having taken the young crusaders aboard, set sail from the harbor of Marseilles. After two days at sea a tempest arose in which two ships with all aboard were lost on the rocks at the island of San Pietro. Here some years later Pope Gregory IX established the Church of the New Innocents in memory of those who had perished. The other five ships which had weathered the storm were brought with their human cargo to Bougie and Alexandria where they were sold into slavery among the Saracens. It is said that the Caliph bought four hundred, all of whom were clerics and eighty of whom were priests, in order to segregate them from the rest. It is also related that in the same year eighteen of the children suffered martyrdom at Bagdad rather than renounce their

43 "Chronicae Regiae Coloniensis Continuatio Prima", *MGSS*, XXIV, 17-18; "Annales Marbacenses", *MGSS*, XVII, 172.

44 "Annales Marbacenses", *MGSS*, XVII, 172; "Chronica Albrici Monachi Trium Fontium", *MGSS*, XXIII, 893-894.

45 "Chronicae Regiae Coloniensis Continuatio Prima", *MGSS*, XXIV, 17-18; "Chronica Albrici Monachi Trium Fontium", *MGSS*, XXIII, 893-894.

46 "Chronica Albrici Monachi Trium Fontium", *MGSS*, XXIII, 893-894.

faith. Further on the chronicler tells that the two merchants of Marseilles were later discovered plotting with the Saracens of Sicily against Frederick II and were hanged for this treachery. The reaction of the Pope to the whole movement is said to have been expressed in the words: "Hii pueri nobis improperant, quod ad recuperationem terrae sanctae eis currentibus nos dormimus".[47]

JOSEPH E. HANSBERY.

[47] "Annales Alberti Abbatis Stadensis", *MGSS*, XVI, 355.

ST. MARY'S OF THE SPRINGS
NOT TO BE
TAKEN FROM THE
READING ROOM
COLLEGE LIBRARY

FRENCH DIPLOMACY IN PHILADELPHIA: 1778-1779 *

For many years historians have been writing of the diplomacy of the American Revolution. They have invariably centered their attention upon the relations between France and the United States, for those were the only foreign relations effectively maintained by the young Republic before the treaty of peace of 1783. When considering Franco-American diplomatic contacts, they have been prone to forget that America's connection with France had a two-fold diplomatic link. Not only was the United States represented in Paris between 1776 and 1783 by such men as Silas Deane and Benjamin Franklin, but France was also represented in Philadelphia during the same period by able diplomats, Conrad Alexandre Gérard and the Chevalier de La Luzerne. In other words, the story of American Revolutionary diplomacy cannot be told by reference to what went on in Paris alone.

24
-39

Philadelphia was, likewise, the scene of momentous decisions in the realm of diplomacy, for it was there that the Continental Congress, the supreme governing body of the new American state, deliberated upon foreign affairs and resolved upon the policy its representatives abroad should follow.

After July 12, 1778, the character of Philadelphia diplomacy changed, for on that date arrived in the city one Conrad Alexandre Gérard of France, the first foreign envoy ever accredited to the United States of America. Before Gérard's coming the members of the Continental Congress had debated foreign affairs in the greatest secrecy,[1] and in reaching their resolves, had been guided only by their own common sense, and by the infrequent and long-delayed despatches from their representatives in France. They necessarily worked largely in the dark. The inevitable result of

* Paper read at the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, December 29, 1937, Philadelphia, Penna.

[1] See resolution of secrecy adopted by the Continental Congress on November 9, 1775, in W. C. Ford et al. (eds.), *Journals of the Continental Congress* (34v., Washington, 1904-37), III, 344-345, hereinafter referred to as *Journals*.

such a situation was that the envoys in Paris remained for months on end without instructions.[2] When, finally, they received word from the Congress, it was not at all uncommon for them to find their new instructions already made obsolete by the unceasing march of events.

Gérard's arrival improved the situation. The new envoy had surrendered the post of *premier commis* of the French foreign office to accept the mission to Philadelphia. As *premier commis*, he had been first assistant to the foreign minister, Charles Gravier, Comte de Vergennes.[3] In that capacity, he had conducted all the negotiations with the American commissioners that culminated in the two treaties signed with France on February 6, 1778.[4] Gérard was therefore completely informed on French policy towards the United States, and was furthermore completely *au courant* with the general foreign policy of France. No single individual other than Vergennes himself could have been more suited than Gérard to interpret to the Congress in Philadelphia the aims of French diplomacy. None other was so well equipped to aid the Congress in overcoming the obstacles to harmonious collaboration between France and America.[5]

[2] Silas Deane wrote the Committee of Secret Correspondence, October 1, 1776: "For Heaven's sake, if you mean to have any connection with this kingdom, be more assiduous in getting your letters here" (Francis Wharton, ed., *The Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States* ... [6v., Washington, 1889], II, 153, hereinafter referred to as Wharton).

[3] For material on Vergennes and his work consult Denise Aimé, "Vergennes: Essai de Bibliographie Historique et Critique," in *The Franco-American Review*, I (1936), no. 2, 149-159.

[4] The most satisfactory account of the negotiations resulting in the treaties of 1778 may be found in Samuel F. Bemis, *The Diplomacy of the American Revolution* (New York, 1935). The texts of the treaties have been printed in various places, but the most accurate impressions appear in Hunter Miller (ed.), *Treaties and Other International Acts of the United States of America* (In progress, 6v., Washington, 1931-37), II, 3-46; and in Gilbert Chinard (ed.), *The Treaties of 1778 and Allied Documents* (Baltimore, 1928).

[5] No biography of Gérard has as yet been published. The material in print concerning him is most fragmentary and of indifferent accuracy. A brief account of his life and work, drawn from original sources, will be included in the forthcoming publication by the Institut Français de Washington of his official correspondence with Vergennes, 1778-80. Born in Alsace of middle-class parentage, he was one of that brilliant group of eighteenth century diplomats trained under Schoepflin at the University of Strasbourg. Before

Congress recognized this fact and lifted the ban of secrecy concerning foreign affairs with regard to Gérard.[6] This action was fortuitous from various points of view. Not only did it make available to the somewhat provincial members of the Congress the advice of a thoroughly-trained diplomat, but it also preserved for posterity an account of diplomacy at Philadelphia that would otherwise have been lacking. We may search through the secret journals of the Continental Congress, we may thumb through the voluminous pages of letters of members of the Congress, we may exhaust every American source in an attempt to discover the material for a comprehensive account of Philadelphia diplomacy. All our questing will be in vain. The *Journals* set forth in terse sentences the final resolves of Congress on foreign affairs, but they contain no word concerning the debates, the bargains, the lobbying, that preceded those resolves. The letters of the members produce veiled hints as to what went on, but nothing more, for the pledge of secrecy bound them all to remain silent on such matters of high policy. But at the Quai d'Orsay in Paris are preserved intact the detailed reports of Gérard. Over a period of sixteen months he sent back to France one hundred fifty long letters in which he detailed all that went on in Congress concerning foreign affairs during the most critical period of the American Revolution, July, 1778-October, 1779. His successor, La Luzerne, completed the task to the signing of the treaty of peace in 1783. Gérard's despatches are, therefore, the best source available for information concerning the foundation of diplomatic negotiation in the United States. These despatches will be made completely available in print for the first time during the course of 1938, when they will appear as one of the "Historical Documents" of the Institut Français de Washington.[7]

being called to the Foreign Office in 1766, Gérard served as secretary of legation and chargé d'affaires at the court of the Elector Palatine in Mannheim, and as first secretary and chargé of the French Embassy in Vienna. He spoke and wrote both German and English with fluency.

[6] See Gérard to Vergennes, January 4, 1779, in Archives des Affaires Etrangères (Paris), correspondance politique, Etats-Unis, vol. 7, f. 34, hereinafter referred to as AAE-cp-(EU).

[7] John J. Meng (ed.), *Despatches and Instructions of Conrad Alexandre Gérard, 1778-1780 ... With an historical introduction and notes* (In press).

It is impossible to outline in a paper of this type the whole story of French diplomacy at Philadelphia, for even such a short period as sixteen months. But a few of the salient features of Gérard's activity may be recalled. Before considering them, however, it must be remembered that formal Franco-American relations were the result of manifold precedent events, stretching as far back as 1765, when the Duc de Choiseul, then French Minister of Foreign Affairs, toyed with the idea of separating Britain's American colonies from the mother country as one means of restoring French prestige, so badly damaged by the peace treaty of 1763 that had taken from France practically all of her American possessions.[8] Even before the Declaration of Independence the Continental Congress had sent Silas Deane to France as a political and commercial agent entrusted with the task of securing French assistance in the rebellion against England.[9] Later he was joined with Benjamin Franklin and Arthur Lee as commissioners to obtain recognition of the United States, and if possible, military as well as financial assistance.[10] During this early formative period of Franco-American

[8] Henri Doniol, *Histoire de la participation de la France à l'établissement des Etats-Unis d'Amérique* ... (5v., Paris, 1886-92), I, 6, hereinafter referred to as Doniol; C. Giraud, "Mémoire de Choiseul remis au Roi en 1765," in *Journal des Savants* (1881), 171, 250; Bemis, *Diplomacy of the American Revolution*, 16-18; C. H. Van Tyne, "French Aid Before the Alliance of 1778," in *The American Historical Review*, XXI, 23-28; documents published by A. Doysié, *ibid.*, XXVI, 726-747, XXVII, 70-89.

[9] Deane had formerly been a member of Congress from Connecticut. His appointment was a joint affair; both the Secret Committee, concerned with commercial matters, and the Committee of Secret Correspondence, interested in political matters, named him as their representative in France. This action is not recorded in the *Journals*, but Deane's credentials and instructions from the two committees are in Edmund C. Burnett (ed.), *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* (8v., Washington, 1921-36), I, nos. 532, 534, 535, hereinafter referred to as Burnett, and in New York Historical Society, *Collections: The Deane Papers ... 1774-1790* (5v., New York, 1887-90), I, 116-119, 123-126. The appointment and letter of instruction from the Secret Committee is dated March 1, 1776; his credentials from the other committee is dated March 2, and his instructions March 3; see Wharton, II, 78-80.

[10] The commission to France as originally appointed on September 26, 1776, consisted of Franklin, Deane, and Thomas Jefferson. Family misfortunes necessitated Jefferson's refusal of the post, and Arthur Lee, then in London, was named in his stead, October 22, 1776 (*Journals*, V, 897). The instructions

relations, the French ministry was well aware of the possibilities for good and evil inherent in the situation. Careful studies of the colonial revolt had been made before Deane set foot on the soil of France.[11] Once he put in an appearance, he found a friendly reception awaiting him.[12] France, however, was not yet ready to commit herself to open alliance, or even to recognition of the United States. She wished to be sure of two things before taking such a drastic step. The first necessity was military and naval preparedness, the second was Spanish support. Vergennes consequently parried all American requests for recognition while he urged upon Spain the utility of cooperating with the insurgents, and upon the French ministry the necessity of preparing for war. As he followed this involved policy, vastly complicated by the general European situation, he encouraged the Americans to hope for eventual success in their attempt to obtain French cooperation. He arranged for a secret subsidy by France and Spain that would finance the operations of a privately operated commercial concern engaged in shipping military supplies to the United States.[13] Eventually, toward

to the commissioners were dated September 24, and supplementary instructions October 16; the texts are in *ibid.*, 813-816, 897.

[11] See Vergennes' "Exposé succinct sur la situation politique de la France relativement à différentes puissances," December 8, 1774 (Doniol, I, 14-20); Vergennes to Ossun, August 7, 1775 (*ibid.*, 123-127); report of Bonvouloir to De Guines, December 28, 1775 (*ibid.*, 287-292, 267-269); Vergennes' "Considerations sur l'affaire des colonies anglaises de l'Amérique," March 12, 1776 (B. F. Stevens, ... *Facsimiles of Manuscripts in European Archives Relating to America* ... [London, 1889-98; hereinafter referred to as Stevens's *Facsimiles*], XIII, no. 1316; Doniol, I, 273-278); Vergennes' "Réflexions sur la conduite qu'il convient à la france de tenir à l'égard Colonies Anglaises," April, 1776 (*ibid.*, 243-249, misdated). Deane arrived in Paris July 6, 1776 (Stevens's *Facsimiles*, IX, no. 890; Deane to Committee of Secret Correspondence, August 18, 1776, Wharton, II, 112).

[12] See Bancroft's narrative of Deane's mission, Stevens's *Facsimiles*, IX, no. 890; Deane to Committee of Secret Correspondence, August 18, 1776, Wharton, II, 112-127. See also N. Y. Hist. Soc., *Collections: Deane Papers*, I, 179-180, 198-199, 200-201.

[13] This was the house of Roderigue Hortalez et Cie., presided over by the versatile dramatist, Pierre Augustin Caron de Beaumarchais, author of the *Barber of Seville*. The literature on this phase of French secret aid to the United States before the alliance is very extensive. Only a few of the more important studies in the field can be mentioned here: Doniol, I, chaps 11, 14,

the end of 1777, Vergennes became convinced that the time had arrived for active and open participation in the American revolt. Spain still refused to go along with France, but the Americans were becoming impatient, and French military and naval preparations were nearing completion. This situation encouraged the Foreign Minister to take the step formally requested by Franklin and his colleagues a year before. France negotiated with the United States, February 6, 1778, three agreements, the first formal international engagements to which the new Republic was a party.[14] The first was a Treaty of Amity and Commerce, granting recognition and reciprocal commercial privileges. The second was a Treaty of Eventual Alliance, providing that should war ensue between England and France because of recognition of the United States, the two contracting parties would ally themselves in the conduct of the war against Britain, and that neither would make a truce or peace without the consent of the other. The third engagement signed February 6 was a separate and secret article, granting to Spain the privilege of acceding to the other two treaties at any future time.

These were the bases of Franco-American relations in 1778. Shortly after the treaties were signed, Gérard, with a French naval squadron under the command of the Comte d'Estaing, was sent to America. The task set before the new French minister was no simple one. The land to which he was traveling was to a large extent a political and social *terra incognita* to the French Court. The government was acquainted in a superficial way with the

II, chaps. 2, 3, 6, 10, *passim*; Louis de Loménie, *Beaumarchais et son temps* (2v., Paris, 1856); John Durand, *New Materials for the History of the American Revolution*... (New York, 1889); Elizabeth S. Kite, *Beaumarchais and the War of American Independence* (2v., Boston, 1918); E. S. Corwin, *French Policy and the American Alliance of 1778* (Princeton, 1916); Valentin Urtasun, *Historia Diplomática de América*, pt. I: *La Emancipación de las colonias Británicas* (2v., Pamplona, 1920-24); Bemis, *Diplomacy of the American Revolution*; Juan F. Yela Utrilla, *España ante la independencia de los Estados Unidos* (2v., Lérida, 1925).

[14] Concerning the negotiation of these agreements, see Stevens's *Facsimiles*, III, no. 335, V, no. 492, VIII, nos. 772, 774, 784, XXI, nos. 1824, 1827, 1828, 1831, 1838, XXII, no. 1865; Doniol, II, chap. 11, *passim*; see particularly Bemis' excellent notes to the sources for these negotiations in his *Diplomacy of the American Revolution*, 58-69.

republican institutions the insurgents had established, but exact knowledge concerning their operation, and the interplay of domestic political factors behind them was not to be had in Europe. Gérard's first duty, therefore, was to act as general liaison officer between the two allied nations, and to report to Vergennes everything that might be helpful in orientating French policy to American requirements.[15]

All Europe recognized that the mere negotiation of the Treaties of Amity and Commerce and of Alliance by France and the United States did not effect the *de facto* union which they stipulated. The people of the United States were traditional enemies of the country to which they were now allied. There existed no common tie of language, race, religion, institutions, or custom to assist in making coöperation with France palatable to Anglo-Saxon America. Vergennes had little doubt that Congress would ratify the Treaty of Amity and Commerce, for by it America gained recognition and valuable commercial advantages, and lost nothing. But there was another point connected with the Alliance that worried him considerably. Even after ratification of the Treaty, alliance did not become effective until war had broken out between Great Britain and France as a result of American recognition. Vergennes was convinced that war would occur, but he knew that England would avoid any formal declaration, for that would leave no way open to the Americans to evade fulfillment of their agreement with France. He expected hostilities to begin in a rather haphazard manner, and subsequent events justified his belief. With an anti-French group in Congress, recognition of the binding force of the Treaty of Alliance might then be deferred or refused on the grounds that war had not been declared, or that if a state of war existed, it did not exist as the result of French recognition of the United States.

The political complexion of America afforded a basis for Vergennes' uneasiness. The colonial insurrection was the fruit of many seeds of discontent sown by the British Government throughout the thirteen colonies. These seeds had flourished most vigorously in

[15] For Gérard's initial instructions from Vergennes, dated March 29, 1778, see Doniol, III, 153-157. A somewhat inexact English translation is in Wharton, II, 523-526. The original draft of the instructions is in AAE-cp-(EU) 3: 159.

Massachusetts and Virginia. Those two great colonies had taken the lead in persuading their neighbors to join with them in opposition to British rule. One of the most potent reasons impelling Massachusetts and Virginia to their violent reaction against the mother country was the passage by Parliament in 1774 of the Quebec Act, depriving Virginia of her claims to western lands and setting up on the borders of Massachusetts a powerful political subdivision of the Empire in which Roman Catholicism was recognized and tolerated.[16] The decision to make the struggle one for complete independence was arrived at under pressure from the radical leaders of colonial thought, in the forefront of whom were the Adamses of Massachusetts and the Lees of Virginia. Certain sections of the United States were still notably lukewarm in their support of Congress when Gérard arrived in Philadelphia, but by then the situation had been, in a certain sense, reversed.

The desire of Congress in opening relations with France was to secure recognition and commercial assistance. Alliance did not enter into the proposals first advanced.[17] Before the treaties had been concluded, however, the battle of Saratoga had been won; complete independence no longer seemed an impossible goal to less radically-minded Americans. French alliance now appeared to be

[16] Concerning the Quebec Act and its influence on the American Revolution, see Reginald Coupland, *The Quebec Act, a Study in Statesmanship* (Oxford, 1925); and Victor Coffin, *The Province of Quebec and the Early American Revolution* (Madison, Wis., 1896).

[17] The instructions to the American commissioners in Paris of September 17, October 16, 1776, did not specifically authorize them to make a treaty of alliance, but the term "treaty of commerce and alliance" was used in two letters to Deane from the Committee of Secret Correspondence, October 2, 1776 (Wharton, II, 162-163; N. Y. Hist. Soc., *Collections: Deane Papers*, I, 301-303), and October 24, 1776 (Wharton, II, 181-182; N. Y. Hist. Soc., *Collections: Deane Papers*, I, 335-336). When France proposed to recognize the United States, the commissioners discovered that the price of such action was the negotiation of a treaty of alliance, for France understood that recognition meant war with Great Britain. See Vergennes' account of his initial conference with the Americans concerning the negotiation of the treaties of 1778 in his letter to Montmorin, December 13, 1777, in Stevens's *Facsimiles*, XX, no. 1774; Doniol, II, 637-642. The commissioners' narrative of the same conference, in their letter to the Committee of Foreign Affairs, December 18, 1777, was extremely sketchy; they had pledged themselves for the time being to inviolable secrecy. It is printed in Wharton, II, 452-454.

an undisguised blessing to the people who had at first hesitated to follow the New England extremists, for it promised powerful aid and offered the best guarantee of success. Having acquiesced somewhat half-heartedly in the final break with the mother country, they were now ready to accept gratefully any help that might dispel the necessity of a disastrous reconciliation. On the other hand, the political connection with France was never received warmly by the New Englanders or their followers, although it proved the salvation of the cause of independence they had been the first to espouse. The terms of the treaties concluded in Paris were generous, but an inbred distrust of France, her institutions and her ambitions, previously manifested in opposition to the Quebec Act, compelled the former radicals to look with suspicious eye upon every proposal emanating from Versailles. To compel Franco-American coöperation in spite of this distrust and the active opposition it engendered proved the most difficult task presented to Gérard.[18]

The French Minister approached this American scene with an European viewpoint. Formed in the Old-World school of diplomacy that calculated realities and left enthusiasm to the idealists, he saw the young American state objectively. His estimate of her strength and resources, moral and physical, was not distorted by any patriotic sentimentality or provincial egoism. These thirteen disjointed United States appeared to him feeble and ineffectual. He knew the tremendous power of Britain. He had seen her humble his own proud land, and bring under her sway countless miles of territory in all parts of the world. He found America exhausted in spite of her initial successes. Her army was small and poorly provided for; its commander was able and honorable, but many of his general officers expended what ability they possessed in petty intrigues that found dishonorable support among members of the general Congress itself. The ties of union between the states were

[18] The conclusions expressed in the following paragraphs have been arrived at after several years spent in preparing a critical edition of Gérard's official correspondence during the months he spent in Philadelphia. The instructions and reports of Gérard may be found scattered throughout volumes 3-5 and 7-12 inclusive of the *correspondance politique, Etats-Unis* at the French Foreign Office Archives. Transcripts of most of them may be consulted in Washington at the Library of Congress, Division of Manuscripts.

weak, since each political subdivision sought to satisfy its own ambitions with little thought for the welfare of its neighbors.

Such a nation could not possibly conquer the might of Britain without foreign assistance. This was Gérard's view. The intervention of France appeared to him to be the only means of turning ultimate defeat to victory. So inescapable did this conclusion seem that he thought it must be equally recognized by the Americans themselves. He consequently hoped for non-partisan coöperation from Congress in what France considered the common interests of the alliance. The realization that such collaboration could not be effected without difficulty dawned upon Gérard soon after he arrived at Philadelphia. The tone of optimism apparent in his first despatches to Vergennes changed as he became acquainted with the true state of Congressional politics. His every important suggestion met with concerted opposition from a well-organized group of delegates. Quite naturally he concluded that since these delegates did not desire a political connection with France, they wanted reconciliation with Great Britain. No other conclusion could reasonably be expected from a man of sound judgment who viewed the American scene objectively. Yet it seems not altogether accurate. It is not possible to believe that the most radical proponents of independence in all the thirteen states had turned overnight into Tories of the deepest dye! Gérard saw clearly that there were but two possible issues to the quarrel: reconciliation with Britain, or cooperation with France under the alliance. The "party of the opposition", to use the Minister's convenient terminology, did not view the issue with the same clarity of judgment. The members of that party were hard-headed and provincial, and consequently evaluated the resources of the United States more highly than did the trained European diplomat, and more highly than the actual situation warranted. For them the issue did not lie between reconciliation and the alliance, but between independence without political entanglements on the one hand, and coöperation with a former enemy whose policies might prove disastrous to American freedom and ambitions on the other. They did not want the alliance, but neither did they desire reconciliation with Britain. They had no objection to a commercial treaty with France, but they

thought that was sufficient. They considered the United States, recognized by France, and aided by her commercial assistance, powerful enough to secure their own political independence without contracting a foreign alliance. After such an alliance had been accepted as binding in spite of their active opposition, they consistently directed their efforts towards limiting coöperation under its terms to the narrowest possible bounds. An appreciation of their point of view shows them in opposition to the alliance because they feared and distrusted France and all she stood for, and because they thought that independence might have been obtained without assuming political obligations to any nation.

Inextricably bound up with the New England attitude were personal jealousies that greatly complicated Gérard's existence in Philadelphia. At the time of his arrival these jealousies centered upon Silas Deane, who had been summarily recalled from his post as joint American commissioner to France.[19] Deane returned to find his reputation under a cloud because of charges that had been made against him by a brother commissioner, Arthur Lee. These charges involved the whole secret operation by which war supplies had been sent to America before formal recognition had been granted the United States. Deane demanded an impartial investigation of his conduct by Congress, but was given no satisfaction. Finally, in December, 1778, he published a lengthy appeal for justice in the columns of the Philadelphia journals.[20] This action, though understandable, was indiscreet, for it revealed to the public dissensions existing among the American agents abroad, and injected into the controversy the question of responsibility for secret aid. Thomas Paine, secretary to the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the Con-

[19] The order for Deane's recall was passed by Congress on November 21, 1777 (*Journals*, IX, 946-947). See Chaumont to Vergennes, March 7, 1778 (Stevens's *Facsimiles*, VIII, no. 823; Doniol, III, 175n.); Deane to Gérard, March 9, 1778 (Stevens's *Facsimiles*, VIII, no. 800; N. Y. Hist. Soc., *Collections: Deane Papers*, II, 389). See also Wharton, II, 444.

[20] See Gérard to Vergennes, December 6, 1778, in AAE-cp-(EU) 5: 248. Deane's address "To the Free and Virtuous Citizens of America" was published in *The Pennsylvania Packet, or the General Advertiser*, Philadelphia, December 5, 1778. It is also in N. Y. Hist. Soc., *Collections: Deane Papers*, III, 66-76.

gress, countered with a series of open letters purporting to prove that Deane was not responsible for obtaining help from France, and that the allied power had intended the assistance she had granted to be a free gift. To bolster his case, Paine quoted documents from the files of the Committee.[21] These were groundless assertions, that Gérard, as the representative of France in the United States, could not let pass unchallenged. Secret aid was planned as a self-liquidating commercial operation. Although France later indicated her willingness not to press for payment of the supplies that had been bought from the government and shipped to the Americans, she could not openly admit that she had given aid to the rebels before recognizing them. Here was the crucially important point in dispute. The money values involved were negligible as compared with the effect such an admission must have upon French relations with the powers of Europe. The whole operation of secret aid had been invented for the purpose of concealing this very fact. Paine's position, though it was the unimportant one of clerk to the Committee, was official, and the only way in which his claim could be effectively combated was by a specific denial of its truth by Congress itself. This Gérard demanded. After considerable insistence by the Minister, Congress acquiesced, categorically denied having received gratuitous help from the French Government before the alliance, and released Paine from its employment.[22]

It was because of his responsibility in depriving Paine of his only source of steady income, and because of his admiration for his

[21] Paine, as secretary to the Committee, was under oath to divulge nothing (*Journals*, April 17, 1777). His reply to Deane, entitled "Common Sense to the Public on Mr. Deane's Affair," appeared in five "cantos" in *The Pennsylvania Packet* ..., December 31, 1778, January 2, 5, 7, 9, 1779. The reply may be consulted in various collected editions of Paine's *Works*.

[22] For Gérard's account of his relations with Congress concerning the Deane-Paine controversy, see his letters to Vergennes, December 10, 12-14, 9-22, 24-25, 1778, January 10, 17 (2 letters), 1779, in AAE-cp-(EU) 5: 291, 301, 349, 362; 7: 76, 86, 91. The resolution of Congress denying the reception of official aid from France was unanimously adopted January 12, 1779 (*Journals*, XIII, 55; N. Y. Hist. Soc., *Collections: Deane Papers*, III, 257; Wharton, III, 17). Paine submitted his resignation as secretary to the Committee of Foreign Affairs on January 8, 1779 (*Journals*, XIII, 36). Congress asked him to surrender the papers of his office on January 16 (*ibid.*, 75-77).

ability as a publicist, that Gérard shortly thereafter took the former secretary into his pay. He thought Paine indiscreet but honest, and believed that if his pen were utilized in support of the alliance, he might prove a powerful ally in moulding American opinion. Paine, however, was not easily amenable, and as Gérard narrates in his reports to Vergennes, the engagement was short-lived.[23] La Luzerne, Gérard's successor, was more fortunate in his dealings with Paine. He renewed the engagement and utilized Paine's services successfully for several years.[24]

Other problems that Gérard had to deal with in Philadelphia were even more serious. A month before his arrival in America a British commission to negotiate peace had proposed to Congress the formation of an American government within the framework of the Empire closely akin to what we know today as dominion status. The French envoy did not encounter great difficulty in persuading Congress to reject these offers.[25]

[23] An account of Gérard's relations with Paine, in the form of a certificate signed by Gérard, is in AAE-cp-(EU Supplement) 1: 402. It is dated September 22, 1779. With a few inconsequential omissions the entire text of this certificate is printed in Doniol, IV, 62n.

[24] With regard to Paine and other writers subsidized by Gérard and La Luzerne, see the minutes made from the files of the French Legation in the United States for 1777-1796, compiled at a later date by Minister Adet, now in the Harvard University Library (formerly in the private library of William S. Mason, Evanston, Illinois). Photostats of these minutes may be consulted at the Library of Congress.

[25] In March, 1778, the British Parliament authorized the appointment of commissioners to "treat, consent, and agree upon the means of quieting the disorders" in America. The embassy was accorded full powers to proclaim a cessation of hostilities, to treat with Congress and negotiate peace, to grant pardons, and to suspend the operation of all acts of Parliament relating to the colonies passed after February, 1763. The members of the commission were Lord Carlisle, General Sir Henry Clinton, George Johnstone, and William Eden; their secretary was Adam Ferguson. The commissioners arrived in Philadelphia early in June, to find Lord Howe preparing to evacuate the city. With Howe, they repaired to New York, where they remained idle, unable to effect any results because of the blockade by d'Estaing's fleet and the refusal of Congress to treat with them. Their proposals were far in advance of any previously offered, but the Congress remained attached to its desire for complete independence. The story of Gérard's negotiations with Congress in this matter may be found in his letters to Vergennes dated July 16, 19 (2 letters), August 12, 16, 22, 24-25, September 1-3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 20, 24,

After the first outbreak of hostilities between France and Great Britain, in June 1778, it became necessary for Gérard to insist upon a formal recognition by the United States of the binding force of the Treaty of Alliance. He obtained such recognition only with difficulty, and not until he had crossed swords with the New England-Virginia group of delegates under the leadership of Samuel Adams. In spite of determined opposition on their part, the Congress recognized the definitive character of the treaty on Jannary 14, 1779.[26]

The solution of these first two problems was child's play compared with the tactics necessitated by the third major question that arose to plague the French Minister to the United States. Well-organized coöperation between France and America required agreement on the common goal for which the two nations were striving. On October 26, 1778, Vergennes sent to Gérard a request for a clear statement from Congress as to its objectives in the war.[27] He also stressed the necessity of having in Europe an American representative empowered to discuss terms of peace with Great Britain in coöperation with France. Spain was endeavoring to bring about peace by mediation, hence the need for a statement of war aims.

29, October 4, 25, November 10, 14, 1778, January 17, 1779, in AAE-cp-(EU) 4: 97, 119, 123, 237, 249, 263, 277, 319, 367, 374, 394, 429, 457, 485, 513; 5: 13, 100, 155, 161; 10: 332. See also Vergennes to Gérard, November 18, 1778, in AAE-cp-(EU) 5: 179.

[26] The American commissioners in Paris failed to inform Congress that the French Government considered the naval combat that took place on June 17, 1778, as the beginning of open warfare. See A. Lee to the Committee of Foreign Affairs, July 1, and Franklin, A. Lee, and J. Adams to the President of Congress, July 20, 1778 (Wharton, II, 637, 650). Vergennes instructed Gérard on July 28, to obtain a formal recognition from Congress that the Treaty of Alliance had become operative (AAE-cp-EU, 4: 154). This order Gérard fulfilled by requesting such an acknowledgment in two letters to the President of Congress, dated December 7, 1778 (Doniol, IV, 56; English translation in Wharton, II, 855) and January 10, 1779 (English translation in *id.*, III, 16-17). The text of the final resolve by Congress is in *Journals*, XIII, 61-63. Gérard's account of his difficulties with the group of delegates led by Samuel Adams may be found in his letters to Vergennes dated December 10, 12-14, 24-25, 1778, January 4, 17, 1779, in AAE-cp-(EU) 5: 291, 301, 362; 7: 34, 86.

[27] AAE-cp-(EU) 5: 105.

Should the mediation fail, Spain was ready to join in war on Britain, which would necessitate some knowledge by France of America's attitude towards Spanish possessions in North America, in order that France might harmonize the aims of her two allies who maintained no formal diplomatic contacts. Gérard received these instructions the first part of February, 1779, and on the fifteenth of that month, he personally placed the gist of them before Congress in committee of the whole. He advised the members that in his opinion the international situation demanded the development of two alternate plans, one for peace, the other for war. The plan for peace necessitated decision upon the terms the United States desired to have included in any treaty ending the war. The plan for war necessitated decision upon the bases for armed coöperation with France and Spain, should the mediatory proposals fail. The execution of these plans should be entrusted to duly empowered plenipotentiaries.[28]

This interview initiated seven months of factional debate in Congress, in which personalities played an important part. The Adams-Lee faction, having been in control of domestic affairs during the early years of the Revolution, had at first not been able to extend that control abroad. The achievements of Deane in France, the respect shown Franklin by the government of Louis XVI, and utter disregard manifested toward Arthur Lee had contributed to solidify their resentment against Gérard, Deane and Franklin. The appointment of John Adams to take Deane's place in Paris had helped to redress the balance of control in their favor, but that temporary advantage had disappeared when Franklin was made sole Minister Plenipotentiary to France in September, 1778. Now, in the first part of 1779, they were determined that the negotiation of peace or war, as circumstances might dictate, should be entrusted to men of their choice. The faction had suffered a serious defeat when Congress formally acknowledged the binding force of the Treaty of Alliance. They saw their leadership, both domestic and foreign, destroyed unless they could force Congress to adopt the

[28] See Wharton, III, 38-41; *Journals*, XIII, 158, 179, 180, 184; Burnett, IV, nos. 83, 90, 93, 94, 105; Gérard to Vergennes, February 15, 17, 18, 1779, in AAE-cp-(EU) 7: 215, 233, 244.

principles they advocated for a peace settlement or Spanish cooperation, and then entrust the carrying out of these principles to individuals well-disposed towards them.[29]

In drawing up the terms of peace Congress was faced with the necessity of defining the boundaries of the United States, of definitely outlining the advantages it hoped to obtain by conquest, of delimiting the extent of its claims to fishing rights on the Nova Scotia and Newfoundland banks, and of demanding or renouncing the privilege of freely navigating the Mississippi River. At the request of Congress Gérard made known to that body French views on these questions.

He outlined what he considered an equitable peace settlement under existing conditions, which were none too favorable to the allies. Such a settlement, he said, would assure the independence of the thirteen states as they existed at the opening of the war, at the price of giving Spain the Floridas and exclusive navigation of the Mississippi, leaving Canada and Nova Scotia to the English, and securing for France the continuation of her fishery privileges on the Newfoundland banks, which privileges had been for centuries the basis of the prosperity of Brittany.[30]

In the months of discussion that followed, the New England delegates fought tenaciously to include as a mandatory feature of the instructions to be given the American plenipotentiary for peace a demand for fishing rights off Newfoundland for the United States. This might mean an indefinite continuation of the war. By utilizing

[29] Practically every despatch that Gérard sent off to Vergennes after February 15, 1779 contained some reference to the major problems involved in drawing up the congressional plans for peace and war. It is necessary here to give a global reference to these letters. Additional enlightening information on the factional debates in Congress on this matter is scarce. A few references are to be found in the letters of the members as published in Burnett, III, IV, while the *Journals* record the various complicated resolutions and votes that were debated upon. Scattered throughout the manuscript Papers of the Continental Congress at the Library of Congress is further grist for the historian's mill pertaining to this controversial subject.

[30] It was at the conference with Congress in committee of the whole, February 15, 1779, that Gérard set forth his ideas on a just peace. For his account of the conference, see his report to Vergennes of February 17, in AAE-cp-(EU) 7: 233. For an account by a member of Congress, see W. H. Drayton's memorandum, in Burnett, IV, no. 93.

every diplomatic and parliamentary stratagem at their command, Gérard and his friends in Congress succeeded in reducing this demand to a " desirable " rather than a " mandatory " clause in the final instructions. The same decision was arrived at with regard to the New England demand for the cession of Canada and Nova Scotia.

The question of boundaries was settled by stating that the minimum concessions the United States would accept must include roughly the territory east of the Mississippi lying between the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence on the north and the two Floridas on the south. In the instructions to the plenipotentiary to negotiate alliance with Spain if necessary, navigation of the Mississippi was insisted upon in return for Spanish control of the two Floridas.

The total result did not entirely correspond to the original desires of France. The United States had refused to limit their boundaries to the territory under their control at the beginning of the Revolution, and they had insisted upon their right to free navigation of the Mississippi. Otherwise, however, they had conformed themselves generally to the suggestions made by Gérard. Although they had expressed a desire for the cession of Canada and Nova Scotia, they had not made the demand a *sine qua non* of peace. They had agreed to Spanish control of the Floridas as the price of freedom of navigation on the Mississippi, and finally, they had not insisted that the recognition of their right to participate in the North American fisheries be admitted. This last was the point of greatest importance to France, and it was precisely the point upon which Gérard's diplomacy was most effective.[31]

The work upon this most important phase of Gérard's Philadelphia diplomacy was concluded on September 27, 1779, a few

[31] A special committee to prepare instructions for the plenipotentiary to negotiate peace made its report August 13, 1779. The report was adopted the following day. The text of the instructions thus accepted is in *Journals*, XIV, 955-966, and with some variations, in Wharton, III, 293-299. Neither printed text follows consistently the text as it appears in either Secret Journal of Congress (Papers of the Continental Congress, Nos. 5, 6). Gouverneur Morris appears to have been the chief author of the report submitted August 13. The instructions for the representative to Spain were finally settled upon September 17, 1779 (*Journals*, XV, 1080-1085).

weeks before Gérard's departure for France. John Jay was chosen United States minister to Spain, in spite of the opposition of the New England-Virginia group that supported Arthur Lee for the post. John Adams obtained the appointment as plenipotentiary of peace.[32]

Gérard's letters tell the story of numerous additional problems and functions that devolved upon him at the same time he was treating these matters of high policy with Congress. Commercial affairs demanded a great deal of his time; he was forced to take official steps to provide for the provisioning of D'Estaing's squadron while a general embargo on the export of food from the United States was in effect. He had to intercede with both the Congress and the government of the State of Pennsylvania to straighten out the tangled affairs of the French Consul General, John Holker. More important still, his was the duty of keeping constantly before the government of the United States the need of utilizing their own resources in the prosecution of the war. He was consulted by, and gave advice to, the members of Congress on public finance. He coöperated actively with Congress in bettering relations with the Quakers and the Indians. He collaborated with the unofficial Spanish representative in Philadelphia, Don Juan Miralles, to forward the political and commercial interests of France's Bourbon ally. He seconded Washington in opposing all suggestions for military expeditions against Canada. He directed a propaganda campaign aimed at inculcating in the Americans a liking for the French alliance. He listened, but not sympathetically, to the irritating pleas of French officers who came to him with complaints against Congress because they had not been given the ranks to which they considered themselves entitled. In all of these affairs he seems to have acted with discretion and tact.

Although Gérard did not realize all the objectives of his diplomacy, he was successful in the two matters that concerned France most intimately. He obtained from Congress a categorical and practical acknowledgment of the binding force of the Treaty

[32] See *Journals*, XV, 1105-1107, 1109-1110, 1112-1113; Burnett, IV, nos. 492, 543, 547, 548, 550, 552-554, 556, 557, 559, 560, 562, 564-566, 569, 572, 581, 684, 685, 688, 695; Wharton, III, 336-338.

of Alliance, and he protected the interests of France in the Newfoundland fisheries.[33] If a diplomat's ability may be judged by the services he renders his government (and no other test seems valid), Gérard was a satisfactory public servant. His diplomacy was not brilliant, but it was effective. His conclusions, particularly concerning congressional politics, were somewhat inaccurate, but the personal jealousies and the multiplicity of interests that motivated the members of that body, combined with the instability of its organization and the confusion inherent in its administrative system were sufficient excuse for more glaring mistakes than Gérard actually committed. On a few occasions his unfamiliarity with the processes of representative government seemed to lead his conclusions astray. But these are essentially minor criticisms; on the whole he carried out his instructions in excellent fashion.

When he returned to France, the middle of October, 1779, broken in health, he was able to look back with satisfaction at his mission in Philadelphia, that had laid the cornerstone of diplomatic representation in the United States.

JOHN J. MENG.

[33] See D. D. Irvine, "The Newfoundland Fishery; a French Objective in the War of American Independence," in *Canadian Historical Review*, XIII (1932), 268-284.

MISCELLANY

The Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, December 29-31, 1937.

The eighteenth annual meeting of the Association opened on the evening of Tuesday, December 28, 1937, with a reception given in honor of His Eminence, Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, under whose auspices the sessions were held. Mr. Norman J. Griffin, chairman of the committee on local arrangements and past-president of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, welcomed His Eminence. Speaking in the name of the Society which for the third time was host to the Association, Mr. Griffin said: "As the Society came into maturity of years, many of its members joined in a new organization which was to be devoted not to American Catholic history but to the general history of the Church. Today we find this lusty child of the original Society coming into its own maturity and meeting here in convention with other distinguished historical groups this week. It is, therefore, with a paternal air and a feeling of great pride in the success of its grown child that the American Catholic Historical Society is delighted to be its host on this occasion." In reply to these words of welcome, Monsignor Guilday, the permanent secretary of the Association, said:

> With this reception in honor of our beloved Cardinal Archbishop, the American Catholic Historical Association opens its eighteenth annual sessions. As Mr. Griffin has just told you, it was the long and fruitful years of scholarly research, accomplished by the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, in its chosen field, the Catholic history of the United States, that inspired a group of some sixty students and writers to found at Cleveland in 1919 this Association for the wider field of general Catholic Church history. It was fitting, therefore, that we should at this time look for leadership to a scholar who had assisted in establishing the Philadelphia Society. It will ever be to the honor of the Association that Dr. Lawrence F. Flick was our first president. It was fitting also that we should ask another scholar not of our Faith, who had helped to found the American Historical Association in 1884—Dr. John Franklin Jameson, who passed away in September last—to make the address of foundation for this new Catholic Historical Association. Since 1919, we have held all our annual sessions, with but few exceptions, in the same locale as the American Historical Association and the other groups devoted

to social and historical studies. As a result, we have enjoyed the unfailing coöperation of the members of these societies, which are in no way devoted to Catholic history. These last three days of the old year are very precious in our eyes, for, in spite of the differences of religious creeds and philosophical outlooks on life, one impulse dominates all these sessions—the quest of truth. I wish to express the thanks of the Association to the chairman and ladies of the Committee on Reception for this very enjoyable occasion. As Secretary of the Association, but more especially as one of his own priests, I ask His Eminence to bless our proceedings during these days devoted to the history of our Holy Mother the Church.

The committee on local arrangements, with His Eminence the Cardinal as honorary chairman, and with the Most Rev. Hugh L. Lamb, D.D., V.G., Auxiliary Bishop of Philadelphia, as honorary vice-chairman, was composed of over two hundred leaders among the clergy and laity, Catholic and non-Catholic, of Philadelphia. The Rev. Dr. John F. Rowan, of Overbrook Seminary, was vice-chairman. The committee on reception had as its chairman Mrs. Norman J. Griffin, with the following ladies as members: Mrs. Harry B. Traylor, Miss Jane Czarnecki, Miss Marguerite Connor, Mrs. F. Allen Barry, Mrs. Vincent A. Carroll, Mrs. William W. Turner, Jr., and Mrs. Francis V. Gowen. The committee on registration and information was made up of some fifty-eight members of the St. Francis Junior Aid, with Miss Elizabeth H. Guiniven as chairman, and Miss Rebecca C. Walsh as secretary.

At the final meeting of the executive council on Wednesday morning, December 29, Dr. Bell presided. Summary reports of the various committees were read and approved. The nomination of officers and councillors for the year 1938 then followed. It was decided to hold the next meeting in Chicago, December 29-31, 1938. An invitation from Monsignor Corrigan, Rector of the Catholic University of America, to hold the meeting in 1939 in Washington was accepted. Rev. Dr. Joseph B. Code, instructor in American Church history at the Catholic University, was elected to the committee on publications and Rev. Dr. Francis A. Mullin, Librarian of the Catholic University, was chosen as chairman of the committee on membership. The first public session was held on Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., with the Rt. Rev. Msgr. J. Carroll McCormick, D.D., Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, in the chair. The first paper, *French Diplomacy in Philadelphia: 1778–1779*, by Dr. John J. Meng, which appears in this issue of the REVIEW, anticipated some of the conclusions which will be found in Dr. Meng's forthcoming volume: *Despatches and Instructions of Conrad Alexandre Gérard: 1778–1789*, now in final press. In the next paper: *The Spanish Crisis and the Press*, the audience was given the benefit of the studies made during the past summer in Spain by its author, Rev. Joseph J. Thorning, Ph.D., S.T.D., professor of sociology and social history

at Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland. So great was the interest taken in Dr. Thorning's review of the Spanish civil war situation that the committee on programme willingly accepted the invitation of the editor of the *Catholic Standard and Times* to publish the paper in its Christmas-week issue. Dr. Burnett's scholarly, albeit humorous, account of the last days of the Continental Congress—*The "More Perfect Union": The Continental Congress Seeks a Formula*—appears in this issue of the REVIEW. The luncheon conference, presided over by Mr. Griffin, was devoted to *Some Neglected Aspects in the History of Penance*, led by Dr. Thomas P. Oakley, Ph.D., of Fordham University. The discussion which followed the reading of this interesting study was shared by Dr. Francis J. Tschan of Pennsylvania State College, Father Felix Fellner of St. Vincent's College, Beatty, Pa., Dr. Martin R. P. McGuire of the Catholic University of America, Rev. Gerald G. Walsh, S.J., M.A., of Fordham University, Dr. James J. Kenney, Director of Historical Research and Publicity, Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Father John M. Lenhart, O.M.Cap., of Pittsburgh, Pa., and Dr. Raphael Huber, O.M.C., of the Catholic University of America. Dr. Oakley's paper will appear in a forthcoming issue of the REVIEW.

The annual business meeting, which was well attended, was held Wednesday afternoon at three o'clock, with Dr. Bell as chairman. The following reports were then read and approved.

1. REPORT OF THE TREASURER—December 1, 1936 to December 1, 1937 (REV. DR. JOHN KEATING CARTWRIGHT):

ACCOUNT I—GENERAL FUND

INVESTMENTS —DECEMBER 1, 1936		$5,500.00
CASH ON HAND—DECEMBER 1, 1936	$1,505.75	
RECEIPTS:		
Annual Dues (including Life Member).....	2,888.82	
Interest: From Investment	165.00	
Cash Sales: From *Catholic Historical Review*....	2.00	
	$4,561.57	$5,500.00
DISBURSEMENTS:		
Office Expenses:		
Rent of Office and Telephone Service .....$	74.00	
Supplies and Service	201.98	
Clerical Salaries	832.50	
	1,108.48	

Expenses Annual Meeting (Providence)	354.60		
Advance Expenses of Philadelphia Meeting	246.35		
The *Catholic Historical Review*	1,733.10		
Donation (*Writings on American History*)	50.00		
Sundry expense	30.45		
		3,522.98	
CASH ON HAND DECEMBER 1, 1937		$1,038.59	
INVESTMENTS DECEMBER 1, 1937			$5,500.00

ACCOUNT II—REVOLVING FUND—*Publication of Documents*

CASH ON HAND—DECEMBER 1, 1936			$ 267.47
RECEIPTS:			
Sale of Volume *U. S. Ministers to Papal States*			48.73
Volume III *Papers*			7.50
DISBURSEMENTS:			
Furst & Company	$ 11.71		
Research and Copying Documents of Department of State for Future Publication	285.00		
			296.71
			$23.99

SUMMARY

INVESTMENTS:		
Account I		$5,500.00
CASH ON HAND:		
Account I	$1,038.59	
Account II	26.99	
TOTAL CASH BALANCE	$1,065.58	
GRAND TOTAL		$6,565.38

2. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS (DR. LEO F. STOCK):

Your committee has no additional publications to announce for this year. Unlike the American Historical Association, our Association does not enjoy a government printing subsidy which would permit us to issue one or more volumes each year. We must be content with offering an occasional volume within our field of Church history, and only when we are certain

of making a permanent contribution to the subject. The *Catholic Historical Review*, our official organ, has, we think, been somewhat improved in content, by an attempted reorganization of editorial jurisdiction which, if followed, will result not only in greater efficiency but particularly in the quality and variety of the various departments. This improvement has already been reflected in the Book Reviews and in the Notes and Comments. The Rev. Dr. Joseph B. Code has been added to the staff as Co-Editor. His scholarly assistance has not only relieved the pressure of work heretofore performed by the smaller editorial board, but he has also contributed much of value to its pages. The Board of Editors wish to acknowledge the competent services of the Advisory Board chosen from the annual membership of the Association. The members have truly served in an advisory capacity; they have also contributed generously to the department of Notes and Comments. We are disappointed in not having completed in time for this meeting the General Index to the first 20 volumes of the REVIEW, compiled without cost to the Association by the Rev. Dr. Bolton. But a dummy of exact size and containing specimen pages may be seen at the registration desk. The Index is about ready for page-proofing; when completed it will be a key to unlock for reader and student the treasures of these volumes. We ask the generous support of the members when this Index is offered for sale. Since the *Papers* of the Association are issued only when the annual meeting is devoted to a single general topic, there has been no occasion for a fourth volume of this nature. The work on the second volume of Documentary Publications: *United States Consuls to the Papal States*, has gone forward during the year. The copying is now completed. This is fortunate since the archives of the Department of State, where the documents are to be found, are about to be transferred to the National Archives, and will no doubt be closed for some time pending their disposition in the new depository. The work of collating this material for our purpose will go forward as soon as possible. It is hoped the papers will be ready for annotating as soon as the editor shall have returned next fall from London. Your Committee desires to express its appreciation of assistance given to various phases of our work by the Rector and administration of the Catholic University of America, the Advisory Board of Editors of the REVIEW, Dr. Bolton, and the various officials of the Department of State, in particular Mrs. Summers and Miss Julia Bland.

3. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON MEMBERSHIP (DR. JOHN J. MENG):

The committee on membership has the honor of presenting the following annual report as of December 15, 1937:

Total membership on December 15, 1936		740
Delinquent members (two years and more)	12	
Resignations during 1937	15	
Loss by death during 1937	8	
		35
TOTAL		705
New members, 1937		63
Total membership (December 15, 1937)		768

The new LIFE MEMBER is Rev. Benjamin J. Blied, M.A., S.T.B., Milwaukee, Wis. The new ANNUAL MEMBERS are: Simon A. Baldus, Managing Editor, *Extension Magazine*, Chicago; Miss Mary Lucia Broening, Baltimore; Henry J. Bruehl, Ph.D., Catholic University of America; Mrs. R. A. Kelly Bryant, Minneapolis, Minn.; James J. Burns, Ph.D., Kalamazoo, Michn.; Rev. Peter S. Canning, Apponang, R. I.; Carlos Castañeda, Ph.D., University of Texas, Austin, Texas; Rev. John F. Cogan, Ph.D., Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md.; Rev. John J. Considine, M.A., New York, N. Y.; Mr. John F. Collins, Providence, R. I.; Mr. Thomas F. Coonly, Cranston, R. I.; Rev. William A. Courtney, New York City; Rev. Thomas C. Donnelly, O.P., M.A., Oak Park, Illinois; Rev. Frederick J. Easterly, C.M., Catholic University of America; David A. Elms, M.A., Newman School, Lakewood, N. J.; Harry J. Gilligan, A.B., B.S.C., Cincinnati, Ohio; Rev. Robert Gorman, Catholic University of America; Joseph E. Hansbery, M.A., Fordham University, New York; Dr. Harold F. Hartman, Villanova, Pa.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward Hawks, Philadelphia, Pa.; Hon. J. Frank Hayes, Mayor of Waterbury, Conn.; Rev. Dr. C. W. Hepner, The Japan Lutheran Theological Seminary, Tokyo, Japan; Rev. Brother Jarlath Robert, F.S.C., Washington, D. C.; Rev. Kerr J. Keane, S.J., Canisius College, Buffalo, N. Y.; Rev. Harry C. Koenig, S.T.D., Mundelein, Illinois; Maurice Lavanoux, M.A., New York City; Edward P. Lilly, Ph.D., Chicago, Illinois; Rev. James A. Magner, D.D., Chicago, Illinois; Rev. John J. Mahon, Freeport, L. I., N. Y.; Rev. Thomas Maloney, Edgewood, R. I.; Miss Catherine E. Monahan, Providence, R. I.; Miss Kathleen E. Murphy, Ph.D., New York City; Rev. Michael J. McCabe, Edgewood, R. I.; Rev. John P. McGowan, C.M., S.T.D., St. Vincent's Seminary, Germantown, Pa.; Rev. Thomas J. McMahon, S.T.D., St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, Yonkers, N. Y.; Park Ridge Public Library, Park Ridge, Illinois; Rev. Andrew Pawelczak, Libn., St. Mary's College, Orchard Lake, Mich.; Viggo F. E. Rambusch, M.Archt., New York City; Richard Reid, A.M., LL.B., Augusta, Ga.; Rev. Philip P. Reilly, O.P., Providence, R. I.; Margaret E. Richardson, M.A., Lake Forest, Illinois; Rev. Mother Agatha, O.S.U., Ursuline Academy of Wilmington,

Del.; Sister Agnes Geraldine McGann, Nazareth Junior College, Nazareth, Ky.; Sister M. Angela, Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio, Texas; Sister M. Augustina, B.V.M., Mundelein College, Chicago, Illinois; Sister Margaret may Feudge, M.A., Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles, Calif.; Sister St. Ignatius, Ph.D., D'Youville College, Buffalo, N. Y.; Sister Mary Laurence, M.A., St. Mary's Seminary, Buffalo, N. Y.; Sister M. Monica, Ph.D., School of the Brown County Ursulines, St. Martin, Ohio; Sister M. Muriel, M.A., Briar Cliff College, Sioux City, Iowa; Sister Maria Regina, O.P., Ph.D., St. Mary of the Springs, Columbus, Ohio; Sister M. Redempta Ward, M.A., President, Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles, Calif.; Sisters of St. Francis of Assisi, Saint Clare College, St. Francis, Wis.; Stella Niagara Normal School, Buffalo, N. Y.; Rev. John K. Sharp, A.M., S.T.B., Hampton Bays, L. I., N. Y.; William Casper Smith, A.B., Upper Darby P. O., Pa.; University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, Calif.; Rev. Joseph A. Vogelweid, Jefferson City, Missouri; James Anthony Walsh, M.A., Ph.B., Providence, R. I.; Rev. Thomas F. X. Walsh, Ph.D., St. Martin of Tours, New York City; Francis A. Arlinghaus, University of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan. Our deceased members are: *Life Members*—Very Rev. Msgr. Cornelius Crowley, New Rochelle, N. Y.; Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, Washington, D. C. *Annual Members*—Most Rev. Michael J. Gallagher, D.D., Detroit, Michigan; Rt. Rev. Msgr. James W. Gillespie, D.D., Davenport, Iowa; Rev. Patrick W. Browne, Ph.D., Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.; Rev. Lawrence Davitt, O.S.B., Ph.D., Manchester, N. H.; Rev. William J. Engelen, S.J., St. Louis, Missouri; Rev. John Bernard Mullin, A.M., Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts.

4. Report of the Committee on Nominations (Rev. Francis S. Betten, S.J.).

The committee on nominations presented the names of the following officers and councillors for the year 1938, who were unanimously elected:

Officers:

President—Ross J. S. Hoffman, professor of history, New York University.

First Vice-President—Carlos E. Castañeda, Ph.D., Latin American Librarian, University of Texas.

Second Vice-President—Very Rev. Samuel Knox Wilson, S.J., Ph.D. (Cantab.), President, Loyola University, Chicago, Illinois.

Secretary—Rt. Rev. Msgr. Peter Guilday, J.U.D., Catholic University of America.

Assistant Secretary—Rev. Joseph B. Code, Docteur en Sciences Historiques (Louvain), Catholic University of America.

Archivist—Miss Josephine V. Lyon, Catholic University of America.

Treasurer—Rev. John Keating Cartwright, D.D., Washington, D. C.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL:

Very Rev. John Hugh O'Donnell, C.S.C., Ph.D., Vice-President, University of Notre Dame.

Rev. William Busch, Sc.Hist.L. (Louvain), Professor of Church History, St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.

Rev. Harold J. Bolton, S.T.D., Omer, Michigan.

Simon Baldus, Managing Editor, *Extension Magazine*, Chicago, Ill.

Richard Reid, Catholic Laymen's Association, Augusta, Ga.

5. REPORT OF THE SECRETARY (MONSIGNOR GUILDAY):

It is the pleasant duty of your Secretary at these annual business meetings to begin his report with an expression of gratitude for all who are coöperating in the success of our sessions. Foremost of all, I desire to thank His Eminence, Cardinal Dougherty, Archbishop of this old historic See of Philadelphia, for his gracious kindness in permitting us to hold this XVIIIth annual meeting under his auspices and for allowing the Association to share with the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia the honor of the public reception given to His Eminence yesterday evening. To the Auxiliary-Bishop of Philadelphia, the Most Reverend Hugh L. Lamb, D.D., V.G., our thanks are likewise offered for having accepted the honorary vice-chairmanship of these sessions. To the chairmen and to the members of the three committees—local arrangements, reception, and registration and information—the Association will ever be indebted for the efficient way in which they assisted us in preparing for the meeting. To Rev. Dr. John F. Rowan of Overbrook Seminary, vice-chairman of the local arrangements' committee, I owe a special word of praise for his judicious guidance—a guidance that has been constant all through the past year. Experience has taught us during the past eighteen years that the success of these annual gatherings depends almost wholly upon one officer—the chairman of the local arrangements committee. It gives me, therefore, an exceptional pleasure to record here the efficient leadership the Association has had since January last in the person of Mr. Norman J. Griffin, who has been also during the past year president of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia. Mr. Griffin caught from the very outset the full significance of the aims and purposes of the Association and his direction has been sure, discriminating and enlightened. To the ladies of the Committee on the Reception to His Eminence, and especially to its chairman, Mrs. Griffin, the Association will always be indebted. I wish there were time to read to you the long list of names of the young ladies of the St. Francis Junior Aid, who are taking care of the bureau of registration and information. I am deeply grateful to Msgr. Wastl for suggesting the coöperation of this group, and to the young ladies themselves for the generous service they have planned on giving to the Association during our sessions. I take this opportunity of offering my thanks to Dr.

Julian P. Boyd, of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania and secretary of the committee on local arrangements of the American Historical Association, for his generous assistance in preparing our programme. Also permit me to mention the coöperation of the management of the Bellevue-Stratford, His Honor, Mayor S. Davis Wilson, the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, and the newspaper men of the city who have had a generous share in our preparations, and I wish in this respect to pay a well-earned tribute to Mr. Edward Foley, of the *Evening Bulletin*, who aided us considerably in this respect. To the chairmen of the various sessions and to the speakers, some of whom have come a long distance to give us the results of their scholarly studies, the Association offers its thanks. Your secretary wishes to place on the permanent record of the Association its profound gratitude to the editors of the *Catholic Standard and Times* who for months now have brought to our people in this archdiocese the message of these sessions. Finally, to our officers and councillors of 1937, and particularly to that most attractive personality, our president, Dr. Herbert C. F. Bell, of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, your secretary is personally indebted for constant guidance.

I regret that I must sound a note of sadness in this annual report. Eighteen years ago, a group of some fifty Catholic scholars met at Cleveland to found this Association. Our meeting that morning, December 30, 1919, was honored by the presence of some of the foremost non-Catholic historians of the United States, among them Professor Edward P. Cheyney of the University of Pennsylvania. We were especially fortunate to have as the speaker for this foundation meeting Dr. John Franklin Jameson, who, up to his death on September 28 last, was our only honorary member. All through these years, in spite of a round of duties in the American Historical Association, of which he was one of the founders in 1884, his was one of the permanent directive forces behind our progress. He never failed to attend these annual business meetings and to give us the benefit of his unfailing wisdom and of his unerring historical vision. More than is generally known, he watched over our development from the beginning. Although not a member of our Church, he realized from the outset how large our share was to become in the advancement of historical science in the United States. Now that he has gone from us, I may be permitted to repeat here a few words from my address at Cleveland eighteen years ago:

> Dr. Jameson may not be known personally to the majority of those present at this meeting, but those of us who have enjoyed his friendship have learned to esteem him as a sincere admirer of the historic past of our Church. As one whose life has been given generously and uncomplainingly to the steady advance of historical study in this country and abroad . . . I rejoice to have the opportunity at this auspicious moment to pay to him a tribute of high regard and appreciation for all he has done during the past generation in making Catholic history better understood.

Since that time the purpose of the American Catholic Historical Association, namely, study and research in the field of general Church history, has never been subordinated to other ends; and steadily the work of our Catholic students and writers is becoming more and more recognized as having an honorable share in the historical scholarship of this country. In that purpose and in the development of our aims Dr. Jameson took a whole-hearted interest. To create a nation-wide interest in the general history of Catholicism and to awaken Catholic scholars to the realization of the need of a deeper knowledge of European history in so far as it serves as a background for our national Catholic history — that from the start was to be the goal. We were to develop slowly, surely, bringing into our ranks only those fitted by training and inspired by zeal to build up gradually an organization dedicated to this noble undertaking. Such was Dr. Jameson's advice. How long this would take could not be foretold, but he foresaw the day when we would be strong enough in numbers to pass to the second stage of our progress, namely, the creation of four separate Conferences—on Ancient, Medieval, Modern and Contemporary Catholic history.

The time has not yet come for the further development of the Association into these four Conferences. We are still too small a group in numbers to warrant this more scientific approach to our problem; but it is gratifying to note that year by year younger scholars, especially laymen and laywomen, are entering our ranks. It may be, then, that when the Association reaches its silver jubilee in 1944—seven years from now—we shall be able to begin this very necessary division of our labors. Meanwhile, close to 200 papers on ecclesiastical history have been read during our eighteen annual sessions, and most of these have reached the world of scholarship through the *Catholic Historical Review*, the official organ of the Association. The papers read at three of our annual meetings: 1925, 1931 and 1933, have been published under the titles: *Church Historians, The Church in Contemporary Europe (1919-1931)*, and the *Catholic Philosophy of History*.

Like all learned societies our innermost desire is to bring to light new historical material. Under this aspect of our work one volume in our series called *Publications* has so far appeared, the work of Dr. Leo F. Stock of the Department of History, Carnegie Institution of Washington, and Associate-Professor of American History in the Catholic University of America. It is entitled *United States Ministers to the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches (1848-1868)*. This volume of almost 500 pages, including Dr. Stock's illuminating Introduction, has met with universal praise from reviewers here and abroad. In it, I see the direct influence of Dr. Jameson. No one among the younger American historians enjoyed Dr. Jameson's affection and confidence as did Dr. Stock, who is the executor of his estate; and all those who know the value of these

official documents during the twenty years when our country was represented at the papal court, will rejoice that once we are financially able to do so, a second volume will be issued with the title, *United States Consuls to the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches (1791-1870)*, of which Dr. Stock has just spoken in the Report of his Committee.

I have now the honor of anticipating a further development of the work of this committee, that is, the announcement of another series to be entitled *Historical Collections*. As an initial study we are contemplating a volume whose design will follow closely that of Dr. Jameson's series, *Original Narratives of American History*. The first volume will be called *Americana Catholica Historica*, or, *Historical Documents on the Catholic Church in the United States*. An Introduction will explain the value of all contemporary documents for our national Catholic history, as we find in analogous collections of the Churches in other countries. The contents of the volume are to be carefully chosen. The colonial period need not be considered, since the principal Catholic documents have already been printed in Dr. Jameson's *Original Narratives*. The first volume will embrace the years 1784 to 1829, that is, from the appointment of Father Carroll as Prefect-Apostolic of the Church here to the First Provincial Council of Baltimore. Each document will be prefaced with an historical introduction, containing the necessary data on the author and his times and the reason for its composition. All documents will be translated, where necessary, and in all cases where elucidation of the text is advisable, notes will be given, so that each document will be fully prepared for use by the student. In each case the document itself will be placed in its European background. Some of the earliest of these documents already printed by Shearer in his *Pontificia Americana* (Washington, D. C., 1933) will need to be included in order to round out the useableness of the volume. The summary to follow each of these documents will contain references to all other printed sources for these early years of the Church in the United States, and each document will be further explained with notes which will place it where necessary in its American social and religious setting. To prepare this first volume of our *Historical Collections* and to print the same would require a subsidy of five thousand dollars, and it is earnestly urged upon our members to inspire some wealthy Catholic to contribute this sum to the Association for this purpose.

There remains but one last word. Each retrospective glance over the years, as they have passed since 1919, has brought with it a keen sense of thanksgiving to Almighty God for all the blessings He has showered upon the American Catholic Historical Association during the past eighteen years. We pray, therefore, that the New Year of 1938 may have His Divine Guidance in all our deliberations and activities.

At the general session that same afternoon, the President of the Association, Herbert C. F. Bell, Ph.D., Litt.D., professor of history in Wes-

leyan University, Middletown, Conn., read his presidential address, *The Place of History in Catholic Education*, which was printed in the January, 1938, issue of the REVIEW. Dr. Hoffman, who was chairman of the session, was then inducted into the office of president. Monsignor Guilday then read telegrams of good wishes for the success of the convention from Cardinals O'Connell and Hayes. Dr. Hoffman closed the meeting with a tribute of praise to Dr. Bell for his guidance during the past year.

At the morning session on Thursday, December 30, the Rev. John F. Rowan, D.D., of Overbrook Seminary, who had just been elected president of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia, was chairman. The first paper was by Sister M. Barbara, S.S.J., Ph.D., professor of history and political science, Nazareth College, Nazareth, Mich., and was entitled *The Living Constitution of the United States*. This searching analysis into the principle of judicial review in interpreting the Constitution through the authority of the Supreme Court brought into proper emphasis the action of our highest tribunal in overruling at times its own decisions and in modifying its rules of construction. The paper was a brief insight into Sister Barbara's two volumes on the *Federal Constitution*, now awaiting publication. This was followed by a paper on *The Anglican Reunion Movement and the Catholic Church* by the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward Hawks of Philadelphia. The session was brought to a close with Dr. Castañeda's essay on *The Beginnings of University Life in America*. At the luncheon conference, presided over by the Rev. Dr. Cartwright, Mr. Andrew V. Corry of the Newman School, led the discussion on *The Need of a Renaissance in Medieval Research*. The conference was well attended and many of those who took part in the discussion of Dr. Oakley's paper were present and participated in the lively debate which Mr. Corry's questions caused. Leaving aside those aspects of medieval study which attract only the professional historian, Mr. Corry posed a series of propositions: what have Catholic scholars and students been doing lately in the field of medieval research? What should be done to arouse wider interest among Catholics for study in the field? How are we to improve the quality of our investigations? What are the "blind spots" and "neglected corners" in our researches? Are we showing a disproportionate regard for texts and a disregard for the institutional factors of medieval life? And, what can be done to supplement or complement the work that others, outside our groups, have been accomplishing with such success? Out of the discussion which followed many suggestions arose, not the least significant of which was the creation of an organization which would attract all Catholic scholars prepared to develop interest in medieval study.

The final sessions of the meeting were held on Friday morning, December 31. Monsignor Hawks was chairman, and first introduced Father Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., professor of history and political science in the grad-

uate school of Georgetown University, who gave an illuminating essay on *Early Catholic Publishers of Philadelphia*, featuring the work of Mathew Carey, Bernard Dornin, Christopher Talbot and others. *Current Crises and the Perspective of History* was the next paper, presented by Professor Louis J. A. Mercier, Ph.D., associate professor of French and Education in Harvard University. The Rev. Dr. Joseph B. Code, instructor in American Church history at the Catholic University of America, followed with a paper on *The Protestant Tradition in English Letters*, which appeared in the March issue of *Thought*.

Meeting concurrently with ten other societies devoted to historical and social sciences, under the aegis of the American Historical Association, which had the largest registration during its more than fifty annual conventions, the members of the American Catholic Historical Association had the opportunity of hearing many of the papers read by members of these other groups during these three crowded days. The joint programme of the other groups was devoted to the Constitution of the United States, its background, its content, and its repercussions in Europe and elsewhere, thus bringing to a notable close the sesquicentennial year of 1937 in the birthplace of the Constitution itself.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Interpretation of History. By PAUL TILLICH. Part One translated by N. A. Rasetzki. Parts Two, Three and Four translated by Elsa L. Talmey. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1936. Pp. xii, 284. $2.50.)

Dr. Paul Tillich, an exile from Germany, Visiting Professor at the Union Theological Seminary and occasional lecturer at some of the best known American universities, gives us in the first part of this work an autobiographical sketch; in the second, third and fourth parts he claims to be in quest of the categories — philosophical, political and theological — of the interpretation of history. The theological categories are treated under three headings: Church and Culture; The Interpretation of History and the Idea of Christ; Eschatology and History. The second heading has furnished the absolutely misleading title for the book. It is only occasionally that the subject-matter suggested by the title appears on the surface, promptly to submerge again. The remainder are highly obscure philosophical speculations with far-flung digressions, some giant strides into the obscurities of prehistory rather than history, of mythology rather than exact science, and everything colored by philosophical preconceptions of the most subjective type. There can be no interpretation, or philosophy, of history without the mention of God. But what is God for the author? A name, a concept, with which philosophy cannot dispense. But surely not the God of the Christians. He writes, "in face of an objectively existing God, Atheism is right." What the name really means, we do not know: "in face of what the archetypal word 'God' means, rational criticism is powerless." A still more obscure term is used to define it: God is the Absolute. And what becomes of the God of the Christians: "The highest god of monarchical monotheism is not capable of overcoming the demonry of the cleavage of the absolute. He remains a demon, a finite thing that wants to exhaust the absolute."

This metamorphosis of God applies to all other names filched from Christian theology. They mean anything but what they do mean to a Christian. It is the favorite game of the Modernist, a game of hide-and-seek, of confusions worse confounded. The Church, faith, sacrament, justification, salvation and Christ are similarly metamorphosed; they are "holy lies and frauds", to use the author's own terms, though of course not applied to the same thing. According to his own statement, he "attempts to discover things directly without terminological prejudices"; hence he "uses neither the traditional theological terminology nor the

concepts of empirical sciences." In fact, he suggests "symbolically rather than literally, that the Church impose a thirty-year silence upon all of its archetypal words"; for "a situation is hopeless and meaningless in which the speaker means the original word, and the listener hears the objective word."

Dr. Tillich is an ordained Lutheran minister. He glorifies in his Lutheran connection. His one hope had been to be one day a philosopher. His philosophy, ostensibly based on the "autonomy" of thinking, in opposition to the "heteronomy" of Christian belief, as a matter of fact is derived from many masters, a labyrinth of affirmations, negations, contradictions (his anti-intellectualism is impatient of proof), savoring of Fichte, Schelling and some others more modern whom he names, and perhaps others whom he does not name. In spite of all this, he treats Scholasticism with greater respect than might be expected. He senses that the philosophical battle is between Scholasticism and all modern philosophies; he envisages even the possibility that Scholasticism may come forth victorious. He confesses even to a transient attack of the "Roman Fever". That was when the revival of the old Teutonic religion seemed to sweep Protestant religion off its feet. But, really, between the old Pagan Teuton and the modern Pagan Modernist, I prefer the Teuton.

A. BELLWALD, S. M.

The Catholic University of America.

Truth in History, and other Essays. By WILLIAM A. DUNNING. With an Introduction by J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1937. Pp. xxviii, 229. $2.75.)

Professor Hamilton has assembled seventeen of Dunning's short works, including addresses, articles and reviews, and has prefaced them with a brief biography and appreciation of the noted Columbia University Professor of History. The success of many of his students in the field of history, and the literary quality of his writings, are adduced to show that Dunning combined, to an unusual degree, the abilities of an inspiring teacher and of a clear, scholarly writer. Though his rank as a historian depends on his *History of Political Theories*, Dunning was not primarily interested in political theory but preferred to work in American history of the Civil War and Reconstruction period. The two studies: *More Light on Andrew Johnson*, and *Paying for Alaska*, are excellent examples of the digging out, and interpretation of, previously unknown facts about Johnson. They are illustrations, also, of the patient study of primary sources, which Dunning mentions with delightful sarcasm in the opening essay, *Truth in History*. This last-mentioned item is at once the most interesting and the most personal of the collection. In it Dunning develops the point that it is not always valuable to discover what is true historically. Start-

ing with the significant statement that, "the province of history is to ascertain and present in their casual sequence such phenomena of the past as exerted an unmistakable influence on the development of man in social and political life", he concludes that untruths may frequently be more influential in history than truths. This would seem to be correct enough, for many of the true, but obscure facts, discovered by painstaking research are so well hidden even to contemporaries that they cannot have affected in any important way the general course of history. Were this point generalized, however, (and Dunning does not suggest that it should be) it would discourage one of the most important trends in modern historiography, the diligent quest of "what actually happened." Surveying the achievements of recent historians in the United States, in his report, *A Generation of American Historiography*, Dunning selects two tendencies as worthy of note: the concentration on the publication of monographs (which he attributes to the practice of starting a career in history with the writing of a doctoral dissertation), and the trend away from political, military and biographical interests to economic and sundry other points of view. This essay, first published in 1917, ventures to predict a return to the former principles of interpretation. It is a very debatable point as to whether this forecast has yet been realized. The article on *The War Power of the President*, though written twenty years ago, contains information which is unfortunately of decided importance today.

No effort has been made by the compiler to arrange these various articles around any central theme. The book is a "sampler", illustrating the literary personality of the late Professor Dunning, rather than making any new contribution to historical literature. Those who have studied with Dunning will welcome this opportunity to renew acquaintance with the lively comments and discussions of a universally respected teacher. For historians who have not known Dunning personally, this work offers the next best thing, a chance to share in the thoughts of a man whose reactions to the facts and problems of history were always valuable.

VERNON J. BOURKE.

St. Louis University.

The History of the Popes. By LUDWIG VON PASTOR. Vols. XXV and XXVI. Leo XI and Paul V (1605–1621). Translated and Edited by Dom Ernest Graf, O.S.B., Monk of Buckfast. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1937. Vol. XXV, pp. xiv, 478; vol. XXVI, pp. xiv, 512. $5.00.)

These two English translations of Pastor's famous *History of the Popes* serve as a continuation of the excellent work begun under the late Frederick Ignatius Antrobos (Vols. I–VI) and Ralph Francis Kerr, of the London Oratory (Vols. VII–XXIV). The publishers are to be congrat-

ulated in having found a man so well fitted for the translation as Dom Ernest Graf of Buckfast Abbey. Here no foreign constructions, unclear phraseology or servile adherence to the original German mar the clear understanding of just what the author and the translator intend to convey to the reader's mind. The lives of the two popes, the one a Medici, the other a Borghesi, are prefaced by Pastor's customary excellent list of archives and manuscripts consulted; likewise, by the complete and extensive titles of all books quoted in both volumes. The appendix of Volume XXV furnishes the research student with nine hitherto unpublished documents referring to the Pontificate of Paul V. Unfortunately, several typographical errors remain uncorrected; *e.g.*, in volume XXV, page 10, we read the words: "S. Paolo fuori le Mira" for "Mura", and *ib.*, page 261, the name of "Henry IV" for "Henry VI".

Volume XXV dedicates 28 pages to the pontificate of the short-lived Leo XI, the Medici Pope, who reigned as head of the Church from April 1 to April 27, 1605. After a drawn-out conclave that lasted from March 14 to April 1, in which French and Spanish diplomats jockeyed for positions of vantage, a compromise was reached in the election of Cardinal Alessandro Medici. The Spanish Government, represented primarily by Cardinal Avila, made use of every means to hinder the election of the learned historian, Cardinal Baronius. It was equally opposed to Cardinals Bellarmine, Valiero, Medici and Arigoni. Bellarmine was a religious; Valiero was of Venetian origin; Medici had shown French sympathies and was too closely allied with the Grand Duke of Tuscany; and Arigoni, whose learning and ability were unquestioned, was too young in their opinion; and yet that very same year another cardinal, Camillo Borghesi, only 52 years of age, was to come forth from a subsequent conclave as Pope Paul V. "A weak, aged man easy to influence, was the best Pope, a Santori, a Rusticucci, a Saltiati", it said. The French on their part were equally determined not to have one elected pope who might show himself favorable to the Spaniards. On March 11, three days before the conclave was closed, the French Ambassador, Bethune, wrote to Villeroi: "Now we are sure that none of our enemies will be elected, and not without hope that one of our friends will be promoted"; and to his King, Henry IV: "The Spaniards are driven on the defensive, but we have not yet reached the goal." The King himself was willing to use even monetary bribery to obtain his particular aims. On March 7, 1605, his Majesty gave the following instructions to Cardinal Joyeuse regarding the important influence to be exerted on Cardinal Pietro Aldobrandini (nephew of the late Clement VIII): "If we can win him over with money it will be well invested." But the Holy Spirit still hovered over the Church and, despite the machinations of laymen, a worthy pope was elected on April 1, over the protest of an Avila, "that the Catholic King did not want Cardinal de Medici as Pope." In Rome itself unanimity prevailed regarding

the admirable qualities of the new pontiff. During his short pontificate three matters especially merited his paternal attention: (1) The support of the Imperialists in Hungary against the Turks; (2) reform of papal elections that were no longer to be decided by acclamation or general homage, but through secret balloting; and (3) no undue favoritism to France. While formally taking possession of his cathedral, St. John Lateran, on April 17, the aged man of seventy caught a chill which led to his death on April 27. The mourning for this noble pope extended to all circles in Rome; in Florence also the grief was profound; and the sorrow in France was as great as the rejoicing had been a little before.

On May 8, 1605, fifty-nine cardinals entered the conclave to select his successor. Here again politics sought to play their rôle, but once more in vain. This time the discussions were even more heated, a natural consequence of the disorganization of the parties as the result of recent events. French and Spaniards were again divided, each holding five votes, while the Venetians had three. Aldobrandini's party, which sought an alliance with the Spaniards, could count on twenty-six votes. Cardinal Sauli, who drew a pension from Philip III, was definitely favored by the Spaniards and at one time it was rumored he could count on thirty-five votes. But pitted against him were Cardinals Baronius and Valiero, the one having been almost elected pope in the previous conclave, the latter enjoying the absolute faith of Aldobrandini and Montalto. "The only obstacle which presented itself was the opposition of Spain, but it was thought possible to overcome that through the fear of Baronius' election, in comparison with which Valiero's seemed a lesser evil." And yet Baronius sought no more his election on this occasion than in the preceding conclave; in fact, he positively opposed it. During the first days of the conclave attempts were made to obtain the tiara for the famous Jesuit, Bellarmine, but the latter desired his election so little that he said that he "would not as much as pick up a straw if that alone would obtain it." He is reported to have said to the German Cardinal, Dietrichstein, that he "had a mind to renounce even the cardinalatial dignity than through it be exposed to the perilous heights of the Papacy." Cardinal Tosco at one time lacked only two votes of being elected, but Baronius loudly proclaimed in the Sala Ducale "that the election of a man whose manners and speech so plainly disclosed the old soldier would cause grave scandals on all sides." Bellarmine and Tarugi were equally opposed to Tosco, who, although "a most able jurist, had only become a priest late in life and had retained such rough manners that although seventy years of age he did not seem suited to the dignity of Sovereign Pontiff." A regular tumult followed, some shouted: "Let us elect Baronius, long live Baronius"! While some acquiesced, others loudly declared for Tosco. In the confusion some of the cardinals had their rochets torn. All now felt that only from Heaven could come light, union and an ultimate election. In spite of all the efforts

of Tosco's supporters they could not obtain the two votes still lacking for the two-thirds majority. On the other hand Baronius's candidature which the Spaniards opposed with the utmost violence seemed equally hopeless. Finally, after seven hours of fruitless negotiations the senior cardinals of Clement VIII and Sixtus realized that only by compromise could an election take place. Aldobrandini and Montalto then met in the Sala Regia for an interview. The former would like to impose Blandrata. Montalto would have been sacrified; not so Farnese, who opposed the candidature so vehemently that it could not possibly succeed. In the course of the subsequent negotiations between Aldobrandini and Montalto the conversation turned unexpectedly upon Camillo Borghesi, one of Clement VIII's cardinals, who enjoyed the esteem of all and had no particular enemy.

Although Borghesi belonged to neither of the two contending factions represented respectively by the French and the Spanish Governments, the Bourbon King, Henry IV, is said to have exclaimed when he first heard the news of Borghesi's election: "God be praised; the French cardinals have shown that I have some power in Rome and in the conclave." On the other hand, the Spaniards had found no more favor for their candidates with the majority of the cardinals in the second conclave of 1605 than they had in the first. The annoyance of their failure in a sphere which they had dominated for so long a time was all the greater, inasmuch as what they had lost the French had gained.

At the time of his election Paul V was only 52 years of age (born Sept. 17, 1552). With the elevation of the first of their family to the highest honor in the Church the star of the Borghesi immediately began to be in the ascendant. To be "equal to the Joneses", *i. e.*, with the Colonnas, the Orsinis, soon became their ambition. The Borghesi family had its origin in Siena, where its members had distinguished themselves from the second half of the thirteenth century as municipal officials, envoys, military leaders and especially as lawyers. Paul V merited well for science and learning by his care for the Vatican Library; by the continuation of the building of the Roman University; by his enactments in favor of the professors of the Sapienza; and by his solicitude for the University of Louvain. He promoted the study of Oriental languages and the printing of religious books in Arabic; he also founded special new secret archives for the Holy See, a measure by which he has put historians under an immense obligation to him. Paul V was most charitable to the poor. He was generous in his support of the needy Greeks and of the English, Scots and Irish who had been driven out of their countries and sought a refuge in Rome. Regular subsidies also went to the colleges for the training of clergy in Rome and elsewhere, to missionaries, Religious Orders and various charitable institutions in the Eternal City. Between 1618–1621 these amounted to 82,710 scudi (dollars) on an average yearly, or about 1,300,000 scudi for the whole Pontificate. Paul V spent the greater part of his Pontificate (1605–1621)

in the Quirinal. He often spent months at a time in the Castelli Romani. Very meticulous, conscientious and deliberate in all his doings, the whole world soon complained of his slowness. He always reserved a characteristic taciturnity and majestic dignity, which he was able, however, when the occasion arose, to unite with affability in conversation. He suffered little interference from anyone, not even from his Secretary of State. He was very firm once his mind was made up. Among his faults one must condemn his too great interest in his own family and his nepotism, for which he was once charitably corrected by the saintly Cardinal Bellarmine. His sister's child, Scipione Caffarelli, was elevated to the Sacred Purple at the early age of 27. With it went the name and arms of the Borghesi family. As ruler of the Papal States Paul V was continually embarrassed by debts and taxation. Like his predecessors, Sixtus V and Clement VIII, he was rigorous and merciless in the suppression of banditry. He improved the methods of transit, constructed aqueducts for the provision of pure water (Acqua Paolo) in Rome, Castel Gandolfo and Loretto. He founded a new Roman Congregation in 1611 to provide for the poor and, like Sixtus IV, took steps to preserve important documents in special Vatican archives. He continued the work on St. Peter's and saw it brought to a successful close following the complete demolition of the venerable old Constantinian Basilica, all precious religious or artistic monuments having first been carefully laid aside for future preservation. The pontificate of Paul V was unfortunately marred by the ecclesiastico-political struggles with Venice over which he had to place the interdict. The rebellious Servite, Paolo Sarpi, the state theologian of the Republic, caused untold harm as well for his own time as for that of succeeding generations by the publication of his inaccurate history of the Council of Trent. The results of the interdict which at one time (1607) threatened a European war were disastrous for Rome and for the Republic alike (Chapters IV and V).

Regarding the Pope's activities within the Church must be accentuated his bringing to an undecided close the long-drawn-out discussions concerning the operations of grace and the freedom of the human will inherited from the Pontificate of Clement VIII, who had instituted the Congregatio de Auxiliis Gratiae. In 1614 a papal decision was invoked by Spain regarding the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary in which the Franciscans were particularly interested, but here again the Pope refused to be cajoled into a definite pronouncement by Philip III of Spain who had sent to Rome in its behalf a special delegation including an ex-General of the Franciscan Order and had besides won for its support the Archduke of Austria. The Pope went so far as to declare that he would sooner resign than allow himself to be forced into a definite pronouncement. France remained aloof from the question, not only because Spain was interested in having the dogma defined, but likewise because adhering to its Gallican views it maintained that only a General Council

24
-39

33989

would be competent to decide such a matter. "They would refuse to accept a definition by the Pope." On the other hand Paul V took a definite stand in enforcing observance of the decrees of the Council of Trent, particularly those referring to the residence of cardinals in their respective dioceses; promoted the devotion of the Forty Hours, which especially the Capuchins at this time were fostering; issued a special Roman Ritual for the proper administration of the Sacraments and for the individual care of souls through a yearly parochial census in each parish. He had the pleasure of canonizing Saint Frances of Rome, Saint Charles Borromeo of Milan, Saint Thomas of Villanova, Augustinian Archbishop of Valencia, and the Cardinal-Bishop, Albert of Liège, who had been murdered in 1192 by some adherents of Henry VI. He placed among the blessed such familiar saints as the Carmelite Reformer, Teresa of Avila; the Carmelite mystic, Magdalen of Pazzi; the Jesuit, Aloysius Gonzaga; and the Franciscan, Paschal of Baylon. He permitted the cultus of the Dominican, Louis Bertrand (Beltram), whose burning zeal had spread Christianity in New Granada between the years 1562 and 1569 (Chapter VI). This was also the period of the founding and reorganization of Religious Orders, such as the Oratorians (1612), Theatines, Barnabites (1608–10), the Congregation of St. Camillus de Lellis and the Society of St. Joseph Calasanctus, all of which pointed the way to Christian reform and Catholic propaganda as inculcated by the Council of Trent; it was also the time when the teachings of Copernicus and Galileo Galilei apparently contradicted not only the then universally accepted Ptolemaic system, but likewise the *modus loquendi* of the Bible, and brought about the unfortunate condemnation of Galileo's theories and the prohibition of Copernicus' books, the former by the Sacred Tribunal of the Inquisition (1616), the latter by the Sacred Congregation of the Index (1617). Using his usual good sense of apologetics Pastor shows that it was primarily Galileo's indiscreet conduct that brought him into difficulties with the Roman authorities (Chapter VII).

Paul V could be thankful for having had as his counsellors in the Apostolic College such learned and saintly cardinals as Baronius, Bellarmine and Guido Bentivoglio. Among the eleven cardinals created in 1611, two were Religious: the Franciscan-Conventual, Felice Centini, and the Augustinian General, Agostino Galamina. Less happy were the creations in 1615 of the utterly unworthy Louis de Guise, at the instigation of Louis XIII; of the pleasure-loving Carlo de' Medici, son of the Grand Duke of Florence, and of the degenerate Vincenzo Gonzaga, who having contracted a secret marriage with Isabella Gonzaga, the widow of Ferrante Gonzaga, prince of Bozzolo, was declared to have forfeited his cardinalatial dignity in the consistory of September 5, 1616. In 1618 the ten-year-old Ferdinando, son of the King of Spain, received the Sacred Purple. The efforts of the French Ambassador, Coeuvres, to obtain the elevation of the famous

bishop of Luçon, Richelieu, at the last consistory held by the Borghese Pope, January 11, 1621, only a few months before his death, failed (Chapter VII).

Chapter VIII is devoted to the spread of Christianity in missionary countries, especially in the Far East: In Japan (Luis Sotelo and the Franciscan and Jesuit Martyrs); in China (Matteo Ricci); in India (Roberto de' Nobili, S.J.); in Goa and Cochin; in Persia (Carmelites); in Abyssinia (Fr. Paez, S.J.); in Constantinople, Bosnia and Serbia (Franciscans and Jesuits). Of special interest to Americans are the last pages of this chapter dealing with the flourishing conditions of the Church in the New World, which in 1611 was estimated by Giovanni Botero to number already ten million Catholics. In Mexico and in Central and South America, the Church was solidly established and enjoyed the support of the State. In Paraguay, the Jesuits were founding their renowned colonies and reductions; while in Canada, the Jesuits, Biard and Masse, were inaugurating (1611) a mission among the savage Hurons, and the French Recollect, Father le Caron, was particularly distinguishing himself as well by his zeal for souls as by his linguistic studies (1615). Since 1619, French Franciscans were devoting themselves to the arduous task of evangelizing the Abnakis of Nova Scotia. The self-sacrificing labors of the Jesuits, Alonso de Sandoval and Peter Claver, in the cause of the negro slaves shed luster on Paul V's pontificate.

The final chapter of volume XXV is devoted to Paul V's efforts for the pacification of western Europe — France, Spain, Italy, Holland, Austria, Venice and Switzerland. Particularly annoying to the politically inexperienced pope was the duplicity of Henry IV in the recognition by Philip III of the minority rights of the Dutch Colonists without appropriate guarantees of freedom of religious cult for the Catholic majority.

The whole of volume XXVI is a continuation of the Pontificate of Paul V. Chapter I deals with Catholic Reform and Restoration in France after the death of Henry IV and with the revival of Catholicism in the Spanish Netherlands. The pages devoted to the attack on the Jesuits following the assassination of Henry IV and the attack on Bellarmine by Parliament and Richer's advocacy of Gallicanism are intensely interesting. Not less so, although from an entirely non-political angle, are the lines devoted to the Capuchins, the Recollects, the Oratorians, the Ursulines and the Order of the Visitation founded by Saint Francis de Sales and Saint Jane Frances de Chantal.

Chapter II is particularly absorbing for English-speaking Catholics in that it treats of the famous "Gunpowder Plot" of 1605 occasioned by the statecraft of James I against Catholics and their subsequent repudiation of the Oath of Allegiance which occasioned the cruel persecution of the Church in the North of England (1607). Equally appalling to modern

minds, as then to the Catholic subjects of England, were the persecutions of the Church in Scotland and Ireland.

Chapters III and IV deal with the Pope's relations to Continental Europe, whereas chapter VI, the last, deals with Paul V as a patron of art and with the munificence of the Borghesi family.

Paul V died on January 28, 1621. His mortal remains, which were temporarily laid to rest in St. Peter's, were transferred a year later to the magnificant Capella Paolina in S. Maria Maggiore, where already in his lifetime he had erected his own monument. The reliefs and inscriptions on it pay a just tribute to Paul V's labors on behalf of peace, for by the neutrality which he successfully observed between the Habsburg and Bourbons he rendered a permanent service to Catholic interests. Very appropriately, also, do the inscriptions praise Paul V's solicitude for the Church and its temporal possessions, for his share in safeguarding Hungary against the Turks, and for the works of art with which he enriched the Eternal City.

RAPHAEL M. HUBER, O. F. M. Conv.

The Catholic University of America.

A Social and Religious History of the Jews. By SALO WITTMAYER BARON, Professor of Jewish History, Literature and Institutions on the Miller Foundation, Columbia University. 3 vols., 8°. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1937. $11.25.)

This is truly a book of poignant actuality. As a result of late events in Germany, Russia, Palestine and elsewhere the so-called Jewish question more than ever occupies the minds of all, Jews and non-Jews alike. Non-Jews often wonder whether and how our present social order is going to endure or smoothly to usher in another one unless that age-old question be definitely settled. The Jews, painfully conscious of passing through one of the greatest, if not the very greatest, crises of their tri-millennial history, more and more frequently ask whether they will survive it.

Dr. Baron undertakes to answer that question. Many writers before him, Jews in particular, but others as well, had tried their hand at various aspects of it, such as regarding Jewish sociology in antiquity (Max Weber), Jewish capitalism (W. Sombart), or the recent economic developments in Eastern-European Jewry (various Marxist historiographers of the Soviet Union). But all these books, monographs and especially review articles were all more or less restricted in scope. Besides, they had become so numerous that, to use a familiar metaphor, the forest could not be seen for the trees. It was most fortunate, therefore, that so competent a man as Dr. Baron should undertake to gather within the confines on one book the quintessence of his predecessors' researches, completed and brought up to date out of his own vast store of knowledge, with the additional benefit of his truly remarkable gift of interpretation thrown in for good measure.

It is interesting to note that chapters II–XI were first written for a series of ten Schermerhorn lectures, delivered by the author at Columbia University in the spring of 1931; in each he discussed a different phase of the Jewish History from the angle of the interplay of social and religious forces. These same ten lectures appear now in book form and, so far as we can make out, under their same former captions (often cryptic ones such as *The Crucial Test* (Babylonian Captivity), and the *Infidel* (under Islam)). Individually, each chapter is just as self-contained, just as complete, just as independent a whole, in other words just as characteristically a lecture, as when it was delivered in 1931. Collectively, they are a series of monographs loosely following one another in a semi-chronological order, without the slightest attempt at linking them together formally.

This of course does not detract from the value of the book; indeed, in one respect it has its advantages. Nevertheless, it might well have been considered a sufficient reason not to decorate the book with a title generally reserved for writings strictly governed by the law of unity of composition.

It should be remembered that this book is not a social and religious history of the Jews. It is, however, an excellent contribution to such a history, probably the best that could have been made under the circumstances. We most heartily concur with the author in the hope that " however preliminary and tentative is some important sections, the present work will lay the foundation for numerous special researches into the manifold aspects of the tri-millennial Socioreligious history of the Jews."

May Dr. Baron live to write that history! In the meantime we thank him most heartily for the pleasure and profit we have found in reading the present volumes; such a pleasure, indeed, and such a profit, that we would be ashamed to more than hint at the few shortcomings we have come across here and there in the course of our reading, such as occasional lack of clarity in the style, a few evidences of hasty thinking, some inconsistencies, some statements inadvertently left unsupported by a reference, etc. We are sure that other readers will condone such trifles just as easily as we did ourselves and for the same reason.

H. H. Hyvernat.

The Catholic University of America.

Ancient History. By Clarence Perkins. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1936. Pp. xv, 662. $3.50.)

The bright style, attractive arrangement of material on the page, very good illustrations, and fairly well chosen lists of books for collateral reading, cannot make up for some basic defects in this new text book. It is extremely difficult to include within 650 pages a sufficiently detailed and well-proportioned account of the history of human development in the

Near East and the Mediterranean World from prehistoric times to the fall of the Roman Empire, and Professor Perkins has not succeeded in overcoming this primary difficulty. Hence, while he is always interesting, his narrative is too sketchy in many places and tends to become so elementary that it is hardly above high school level. He has also been handicapped by the fact that he is obviously no specialist in the field of Ancient History. He has made a commendable effort to meet this deficiency, but of course could not succeed any better than others of his type. Thus, no specialist in the field would treat of the whole history of the Kassites and Hittites before describing even the beginnings of Egyptian civilization! In his treatment of the foundation of Mitanni he ignores the rôle of the Hurrites completely and thereby shows that he does not know what political and cultural importance they are now assuming in the history of the 2nd millenium B. C. The civilization of southern Mesopotamia preceding the Sumerian is, it seems, ignored. In the light of our increasing knowledge, Egyptian prehistory is treated too briefly, and nothing is said about the significance of the nomes in the political and religious history of Egypt. The religions of Syria and Palestine apart from that of the Hebrews are not discussed. Too much space is given to the Peloponnesian War and too little to the Hellenistic Age. The treatment of the Roman Empire is too sketchy and elementary.

This book is simply not in a class with Stephenson's *Middle Ages* and Lucas' *Renaissance and Reformation* in the same series. As a one-volume survey of Ancient History, furthermore, it cannot compare with the well balanced and accurately written *Ancient World* by W. E. Caldwell, Professor of Ancient History in the University of North Carolina, which appeared last spring (1937). To compare it with Laistner's *Greek History* and Trever's *History of Ancient Civilization* would hardly be fair, as these works, through limitation of the period to be covered, are on a much more detailed scale.

M. R. P. McGuire.

The Catholic University of America.

Königliche Frauen der Wanderungszeit und des frühen Mittelalters. Mit vier Bildern. By Liane von Gentzkow. (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder & Co. Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1936. Pp. 117 in 8vo. $1.00.)

Wagnis in Christo. Maria Ward und die Idee der Christlichen Selbständigkeit. By Dr. Richard Egenter. (Regensburg. Druck und Verlag von Josef Habbel. 1936. Pp. 208 in 8vo.)

These are two books that deserve a wide circulation among the German-reading public; in fact, due to their contents, they would merit an English translation.

Liane von Gentzkow is the learned authoress of *Christina Wasa, Das Lebenshild einer nordischen Frau,* recently (1938) re-edited for the third time. From a Catholic viewpoint her biography of the famous convert Christina of Sweden (1626–89) is undoubtedly one of the best written. The fact that this year the State of Pennsylvania is celebrating the 300th anniversary of the coming of the first Swedes to the New World where under the minority (her father, Gustavus Adolphus died in 1632, but Christina could not ascend the throne until she had become eighteen, *i.e.* in 1644) and the reign of Christina (1644–55) they founded their first settlement, is sufficient reason for every American Catholic to be interested in the authoress. In her *Königliche Frauen, i.e.* Royal Ladies who lived during the period of the migration of nations and of the early Middle Ages, Gentzkow gives us a short biography of 34 Catholic queens and noble ladies, many of them saints of God, who wielded a mighty influence in the cause of Christianity among the Ostrogoths, Longobards, Anglo-Saxons, Franks (Merovingians and Carolingians) and Saxons. Such famous women as Theodelind, Ethelberga, Chrodichild (Chlotilde), Brunhilda, Hildegard, Bertha, Judith (the Frank), Adelhaide, Theophano, Sophia, Mathilda, Cunegunda, etc., all receive just recognition either for the part they played in the conversion of their husbands, of their nations and of the nations into which they were married or for the salutary reform they wrought through their saintly lives and noble examples in the monasteries over which as Lady Abbesses they presided. The book is written in facile German classical style. The type is clear and the four illustrations which grace the work are taken from authentic ancient monuments.

The name of the Ven. Servant of God, Mary Ward (b. 22 Jan. 1585; d. 23 Jan. 1645) is known to every educated English Catholic as the foundress of the "Institute of Mary", better known in Germany as the Community of the "Englische Fräulein", in Italy as that of the "Dame Inglese" and in Ireland as that of the "Loretto Nuns".

The author divides his book into two parts: the first being a short biography of the famous English foundress; the second a study of her spirit and ideals. The biographical part is based on the best known sources on her life, on the early German work *Maria Ward* by I. F. Coudenhove, and particularly on M. Catherine Eliz. Chambers, I.B.M.V., *Life of Mary Ward* (London, 1885), edited by F. J. Coleridge, S.J., in which are transcribed a large number of original documents preserved for the greater part in the Archives of the Nymphenburg Monastery, Bavaria. The study of her inner-self, which makes up the second part of the book, is based on her own sayings, on her principles of conduct, on her speeches and on her letters, especially one addressed to Father Lee in 1615 (the text of which is given in both the original English and in the German translation). The author particularly emphasizes her strength of personal moral courage,

founded on God alone ("Sittliche Selbständigkeit im Christentum"), and endeavors to show the position this strong character-trait of personal initiative and self-reliance, backed up by firm confidence in divine grace and joined with the exercise of all other Christian virtues, should play in the life of every Christian. This study of Mary Ward's nature is deeply psychological and shows that whereas the ethos of her whole make-up was primarily that of an independent, self-reliant spirit, it was nevertheless motivated by conscientious convictions and regulated by obedient subservience to higher authority.

The book is printed in clear English type, attractively bound in red cloth and prefaced by a picture of Mary Ward taken from a portrait in the Institute of "Englishe Fräulein" in Augsburg. It bears the Imprimatur of the Capitular Vicar of Passau.

RAPHAEL M. HUBER, O.F.M.Conv.
The Catholic University of America.

WILLIAM LANGLAND: *The Vision of Piers Plowman: Newly Rendered into Modern English, by Henry W. Wells; with an Introduction by Nevill Coghill; and Notes by the Translator.* (New York: Sheed & Ward Inc. 1935. Pp. xxix, 304. $2.50.)

The title-page adequately describes the contents of the volume: The fourteenth-century poem in a modern English rendering; an informative introduction about the medieval author and the range, style, and quality of his literary production; and brief explanatory notes, at the end of the volume, the purpose and import of which are indicated in the lines, printed at the head of them, that "they have no more ambitious aim than to explain the allusions that may puzzle the modern reader and aid him in grasping Langland's allegorical and literary conventions and in holding the thread of the argument firmly in hand." It is a good book and a useful one to even more than a literary browser. It is a good book, too, in the *raison d'être* of its publication—not merely another book to read or to gather dust on the shelf. Too long has the great English poem of the later Middle Ages been generally neglected by scholars and unknown to the general reading public in its difficult antique English form of speech and in its confusing tripartite fourteenth-century redactions. What attention the old poem has received by specialists in Middle English literature has too much remained a *terra incognita* to readers and even to teachers of literature. The cleverness, not to say the artistic acumen, with which Mr. Wells has gathered into one whole the confusing strands of the tri-textual form in which the poem has come down to us in its many manuscripts is worthy of nothing but the highest commendation, though it is to be expected that those who know the original will quarrel here and there both with the modern phrase and the compounding of divergent incidents. The notes interpreting the

meaning of the numerous allegories are seen quite consistent with the spirit of the age and the temper and purpose of the poet. Each reader of Langland's great work must dare the wisdom to make his own additions to the brief and pointed suggestions given by Mr. Wells. The Introduction by Mr. Coghill, of Exeter College, Oxford, has deftly avoided the Scylla of saying next to nothing pertinent in the short space at his disposal (twenty-two pages) for the many topics it treats, and the Charybdis of engulfing the reader first introduced to the poem in a multiplicity of controversial scholarly opinions. One wishes that he could have found space to give a short book-list of essential references necessary to form a more exact picture of medieval Catholic culture. Because of the problems and controversies with which the scholarly study of the *Piers Plowman* bristles, avenues of understanding of the much-maligned Middle Ages have been opened up by Mr. Wells' modernization.

FRANCIS J. HEMELT.

The Catholic University of America.

The Rise of Brandenburg-Prussia to 1786. By SIDNEY BRADSHAW FAY. (New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1937. Pp. x, 150. $1.00.)

Germany Since 1918. By FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN. (New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1937. Pp. xii, 124. $1.00.)

With the publication of these two small volumes the Berkshire Studies in European History number twenty-six volumes. These very useful little books — scarcely any of them run over 150 pages — fulfill admirably the purpose for which they are intended, namely, to provide a week's collateral reading assignment for undergraduates. The two works under review have been written by specialists in the fields they cover. Professor Fay's account of Brandenburg-Prussia begins with 1134 and provides the reader with a rapid survey of the fortunes of the Hohenzollern family to the advent of the Great Elector in 1640. Almost two-thirds of the book is devoted to the period from the reign of the Great Elector to Frederick the Great's death in 1786. The condensation has been accomplished with a great deal of success. One might wish that Professor Fay had given a bit more space to the development of the religious history of Brandenburg-Prussia in those years. The treatment of the internal reforms brought about in the state by the Great Elector and Frederick II is especially fine. Any confusion arising in the reader's mind about some of these governmental organs will be cleared by reference to the excellent schema which the author includes at the end of the volume.

The work of Professor Schuman is quite candidly anti-Nazi, but the author does not let his dislike of the present régime in Germany run away with him. It strikes the reviewer as a good brief summary of the "liberal" interpretation to the events that have transpired in Germany since 1918.

Professor Schuman is especially good on the causes behind the support given to Hitler by the various groups and classes of the German population, notably the assistance lent by the leading capitalists. In treating the opposition groups more emphasis should have been given to that offered from the two great organized religious bodies in Germany, the Catholic and Evangelical Churches. The more recent interpretation of the rôle played by Hindenburg finds place here, namely, that the old man was nowhere near the giant that he had been thought by many. The author includes several useful appendices, such as a list of the German chancellors since 1918 and the list of Reichstag representatives elected by the different political parties from 1919 to 1933, which will give the student at a glance the graphic picture of the rise of some political groups such as the Nazis after 1924 and the decline of the Democratic and Economic Parties after 1932. A final appendix reprints the Nazi Party Program.

Both volumes include select bibliographies with critical comments by the authors. Most of the items are in English with a few exceptions in German, but of course since these books are intended for American undergraduates primarily the authors kept their audience in mind. In Professor Schuman's bibliography the excellent work of Henri Lichtenberger on postwar Germany is missing, but perhaps it did not appear in time to be included. Both volumes have indices which are adequate. The reviewer noted only one slip in "Russia" where it should read "Austria" at the bottom of p. 130 of Professor Fay's work, since it was Austria and France that were allied in 1779.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS.

The Catholic University of America.

The Cambridge History of India. Vol. IV. Editor, SIR RICHARD BURN. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1937. Pp. xxvi, 670. $12.00.)

This volume contains eighteen chapters, with a list of bibliographies for each chapter, then six maps and ninety-eight photographic plates illustrating some of the famous sites of India.

The volume is again a composite effort. Colonel Wolseley Haig contributes six chapters, Colonel Burn is responsible for three, and it is agreeable to see that the Syndics of Cambridge University have continued to use the work of Indian scholars, four chapters being from the pen of Sir Jadunath Sarkar.

This volume forms a link between Volumes III and V, the former of which portrays the policies and work of the Turkish and Afghan Sultans, while volumes V and VI describe in somewhat elaborate detail the European efforts in India. Volume IV treats of the growth of the Moghul Empire at Delhi, with some details of the System of Collections of Revenue

and the contributions to art, through monuments, palaces and tombs, which the Moghuls so generously erected during their control of India.

The description of Aurungzib's efforts at the close of his career to prevent, between his sons, any repetition of the fratricidal war which disgraced his advent to the throne, and the gradual decline of the Empire until it sank into the hands of nobles who spent their time and energies in placing puppets on the throne, is, on the whole, well done. Perhaps the best constructed story is that by Mr. Rawlinson, whose description of the rise of the Maratha Empire is not only excellent but in places fascinating. The account of the agrarian system by Mr. Moreland, while it presents a side of India's history that has been unduly limited in space, fails to be interesting as it does not explain how the taxes were farmed by the farmer or the headman; nor again does it say what were the articles which paid duty at the ports of entry.

Indeed, the volume is decidedly weak on the side of economic and social life under the Moghuls. That the subject presents difficulties is seen when the references for Chapter XVI are consulted. These are few indeed, but they indicate in two cases other researches by Mr. Moreland and Jadunath Sarkar.

The volume fills a gap, but generally it would be better if the campagns, battles, sieges, victories and defeats could be less and less stressed, and the space thus available made up with chapters on Indian art, architecture, literature, legal systems and the interplay of Mohamedans' ideas upon local Indian customs and habits. The Syndics might visualize for future guidance that nations, races and people write their records in art, literature and architecture. What these records are is vastly more significant than the three battles of Panipat.

BOYD CARPENTER.

Georgetown University,
Washington, D.C.

Correspondent in Spain. By EDWARD H. KNOBLAUGH. (New York: Sheed & Ward. 1938. Pp. xii, 233. $2.50.)

Of the fifteen or twenty popular books on the Spanish situation that have appeared this season, written by English and American war correspondents, this one by an American whom the Associated Press sent to Spain in February, 1933, is among the best. Mr. Knoblaugh had his headquarters in Madrid until the government moved to Valencia, and the picture he draws of Madrid during the Red terror is parallel to the one of Barcelona in July, 1936, which Mr. Theodore Rogers presents in *Spain: A Tragic Journey*. More important, however, in *Correspondent in Spain* is the chapter on how the loyalist propaganda machine operates. The description is timely, written by a witness who has seen it from the inside

and has given the information to the public while it is still of great concern, instead of years later, as happened in the case of the World War. Mr. Knoblaugh evidently has an instinct for truth which made him *persona non grata* to the Valencia government, for he was warned by officials high in political as well as diplomatic circles that he had fallen out of favor by reporting the news as he saw it instead of accepting stories ready-made by the censors. The government had two chief taboos: the part foreign intervention was playing on the loyalist side and the inter-party friction within the Popular Front. When Mr. Knoblaugh described the latter, he was warned by a friend to look out for his life. Daily newspapers ignored this friction until the crash came that ended in the change of ministry from Largo Caballero to Juan Negrin, but the Anarchist and Catholic papers had been reporting it for months; the Anarchist press fulminating against their quondam allies, exposing dreadful scandals of war profiteering and, incidentally and between the lines, writing a dreary tale of chaotic industrial and economic conditions, for which they themselves were largely to blame; the Catholic press patiently and faithfully recording the news. Yet, in spite of the world-wide publicity, of which the Valencian government was unquestionably cognisant, it was considered a major crime for Mr. Knoblaugh to write a news story on the situation for publication in the secular press of the United States. So much can propaganda count on rapid reading of headlines by the general public. One cannot help musing, also, on the willingness of many Catholics to give more credence to what they read in the daily press than in the weekly Catholic press. Mr. Knoblaugh published most of the material of this book in syndicated articles in the Catholic press during July and August of last year. He added many details to our knowledge of the war in Spain, but essentially he told the same story that the Catholic papers in England, Ireland and our own country had been telling the English-reading public since the first day of the war. We may hope that the many Catholics who have been expressing their belief that both sides are equally at fault may find in this book information which they have missed reading in the Catholic weeklies and be led to understanding the Natonalist Cause and, even as Mr. Knoblaugh and many of his colleagues were, to sympathy with it by a nostalgia for justice and law.

E. W. LOUGHRAN.

Boston, Mass.

Archbishop Lamy, An Epoch Maker. By LOUIS H. WARNER. (Santa Fe: Santa Fe New Mexican Publishing Corporation. 1936. Pp. 6, 316.)

As stated by the author of this work in the preface, he had no intention of writing "a textbook for students and historians", and hence his efforts were directed principally to furnish a popular account of the life and times of the Most Reverend Archbishop Lamy. No references are cited nor is

the book supplied with any helpful index. Throughout the entire volume the writer has digressed so repeatedly from the real purpose of his undertaking, that the results of his labors may be regarded as a sort of potpourri of folklore, legend, tradition and historical information about New Mexico and the Southwest in general.

The book may be of interest to the casual reader, but as a biography of the great pioneering prelate of the Southwest it is somewhat of a disappointment. The author has dissipated some of the best features of the heroic career of Archbishop Lamy by a great deal of irrelevant matter, not even remotely connected with the theme in hand.

It is true that as a layman in the field of history and as a person not of the fold of the Catholic Church, the author has shown a keen and sympathetic appreciation and a true knowledge of the character of this remarkable prelate and his ardent zeal among the people of primitive New Mexico, which even today has a large Indian native population. The archbishop favorably impressed every one whom he met, and especially attracted persons of culture and refinement such as the author of this work, who knew him well.

The writer has compiled much important data which will furnish the guides for a more comprehensive, systematic and scientific study of the history of New Mexico. The work shows that the author has been a diligent and careful student of the happenings and achievements in the Southwest from the earliest times, and he is particularly well informed concerning the modern period that portrays the background of this biography. The last word, however, has not been written about Archbishop Lamy as an epoch-maker. In fact, the author has failed to show clearly and specifically the relationship and the influences by which this great figure molded the destiny of the people of New Mexico. It may be even seriously questioned whether any one force was instrumental in producing the net result that brought the State out of the wilderness. That was a slow and gradual process of civilization among the Indians, dating back over the centuries, and was not the creation of one epoch by a potent character. That advancement and development were on the way must be conceded by every impartial historian. The pueblo culture of the sedentary Indians of New Mexico was itself a stage and a degree of progress and self-government not possessed by the nomads of the plains, as every ethnologist has so frequently declared.

Among these people the Spanish missionaries came spreading the same light of Faith, which they had kindled so successfully elsewhere in America, and they were soon joined by civil settlers of the same nationality. It was here that the winning of the West began and, to be sure, under more peaceful and more favorable circumstances than those which characterized the onslaughts on the natives by the white men in the East, whose slogan was in substance that the only good Indian was a dead one. Let us all

hope that some competent Catholic historian may soon undertake the task of revealing the many hidden treasures so that the whole story may be told about Catholicism in New Mexico, a land sanctified by many martyrs and the heroic self-sacrifice of Archbishop Lamy and his successors.

PAUL J. FOIK, C.S.C.

St. Edward's University,
Austin, Texas.

With the Makers of San Antonio. Genealogies of the Early Latin, Anglo-American, and German Families with Occasional Biographies, Each Group Being Prefaced with a Brief Historical Sketch and Illustrations. By FREDERICK C. CHABOT. (Privately published. 1937. Pp. 412. $12.00.)

This book is much more than a carefully selected group of genealogies of the most important and distnguished Spanish, Mexican, Anglo-American, German and French families who made San Antonio their home and contributed in no small measure to the development of the State of Texas. There was a real need for a book of this type. The author has brought together a mass of facts gleaned from innumerable sources during his extensive research in the archives of Texas, Mexico, Spain and France. The reader will find here the only biographical data available concerning many of the illustrious pioneers of this old Spanish town, who the author rightly calls the makers of San Antonio.

The genealogies have been arranged in national groups, each in a separate section, which fall naturally into the chronological order of the history of Texas. Each section is preceded by an interesting and well documented historical introduction which is both a background and a setting for the group of genealogies that follows. Although the author modestly states in the preface that this volume is not a history, the historian will find much useful information and reliable data both in the introduction to the various sections as well as throughout the genealogies themselves. In the Spanish and Mexican section, 99 families are listed, in the French 13, in the Anglo-American 26, and in the German 23. These are the main or trunk lines and their number is misleading as to the real extent of the book, which is truly a praiseworthy addition to the human history of Texas. A perusal of the volume impresses the reader with the sterling character of the Texas pioneers, many of whom were devout Catholics who contributed in no small way to the formation of a new commonwealth.

The book is beautifully illustrated and carefully printed in a pleasing format. There are forty-one full-page photogravures by the Elson Company, which in itself is a recommendation of their quality. The book should prove of interest to the historian as well as to the genealogist. It comes to fill a long-felt need for a reliable group of biographical sketches

of the cosmopolitan group of pioneers that helped to make the picturesque and romantic city of San Antonio.

C. E. CASTAÑEDA.

The University of Texas.

Katholisches Deutschtum in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika. Ein Querschnitt bearbeitet von GEORG TIMPE. (Freiburg: B. Herder. 1937. Pp. xii, 247. $2.40.)

This interesting survey has been sponsored by the German Association for Catholic Germans abroad (Reichsverband für die katholischen Auslandsdeutschen) and the Society of St. Boniface (Bonifatiuswerk). The occasion of its publication is the one hundredth anniversary of the German Catholic Press in America which accounts for the generous space allotted to the history of the Catholic newspapers of this language. At one time journalistic publications of one type or another reached the respectable number of 116. Their story is one of heroic struggles bespeaking a lofty idealism and calling for admiration. Since 1914 the death rate has become ruinous and only 26 of the earlier foundations have managed to survive. Somewhat to offset the loss five new ones have been started within the recent past. German Catholic journalism constitutes an important chapter in American ecclesiastical history, and it well deserves the attention focused upon it in the volume.

Other departments of Catholic life, in as much as they affect Catholics of German descent, enter into the picture. John M. Markert describes the particular character of American Catholicism whilst Richard Mai gives special consideration to the growth of German Catholicism in the 19th century. The flourishing condition of German societies is a matter of pride to all who stem from German ancestry. German Benedictines have done much to cultivate the wilderness and bring the Gospel to remote sections of the country. Their educational and charitable institutions dot the whole country. Not mean are the contributions which German Catholics have made to the realm of science, music, poetry, painting, sculpture and architecture. So far the cultural activities of Catholics of German descent have received scant appreciation and it really is time that they be properly recognized. Two chapters hardly relevant to the general topic have been incorporated in the volume, a scholarly essay on America in Germany's judgment around 1600, by P. G. Gleis, and an exquisite study by Anton Lang, Jr., on Oberammergau; withal one would not like to miss them.

It is to be desired that the richly illustrated and well-edited volume fulfill its twofold purpose, namely, to render Catholics in the Fatherland familiar with the cultural achievements of their coreligionists in America and to serve as an inspiration to German Catholic youth in the United States.

H. J. BRUEHL.

The Catholic University of America.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Dr. Leo Francis Stock, co-editor of the REVIEW, has gone to England for Carnegie Institution of Washington in search of further materials for his series of *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments respecting North America*, to 1783, the fourth volume of which has recently come from the press.

After a decade of service as co-editor of the REVIEW, the Very Rev. George B. Stratemeier, O.P., Ph.D., S.T.Lr., resigned his post owing to his increasing duties as University Chaplain. With the approval of the Right Reverend Rector, the Rev. Aloysius Kieran Ziegler, A.M. (Wisconsin), S.T.D. (Catholic University), Archiviste-Paléographe of the Ecole des Chartes, instructor in Medieval Latin Literature and Medieval History in the University, was elected in his place. As a member of the Advisory Board of Editors, John J. Meng, Ph.D., instructor in politics in the University, was elected in Dr. Ziegler's place. The editors wish to take this opportunity of thanking Dr. Stratemeier for his generous coöperation during the past ten years.

The First Vice-President of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, Carlos E. Castañeda, Ph.D., Latin-American librarian at the University of Texas, has recently been honored by the Mexican Society of Geography and Statistics, the oldest society of its kind in the world, with its annual gold medal and honorary membership.

The Rev. Dr. Henry Hyvernat, Professor of Biblical Archaeology and head of the Department of Semitic and Egyptian Literature at the Catholic University of America, recently received the medal of the French Legion of Honor. Dr. Hyvernat is well known to readers of the REVIEW.

Mr. Richard Pattee, who for many years has been teaching in the University of Puerto Rico and has written extensively in the field of Hispanic American history, has been appointed Senior Divisional Assistant in the Division of American Republics, in the Department of State, which is charged with the efforts to promote cultural relations with Hispanic America. Mr. Pattee is a frequent contributor to the REVIEW.

The Rev. Dr. Maynard Geiger, O.F.M., has been appointed historiographer and archivist of the Province of Santa Barbara, California. As such he is custodian of the mission archives, formerly administered and

developed by the late Father Engelhardt. These consist of 3000 documents, several hundred photostats, and many transcripts, all referring to the old Franciscan mission period, to Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and to a certain extent to Florida. There are also over 500 photographs picturing old mission history and illustrating the history of the modern province. Dr. Geiger is also preparing a *Dictionary of Franciscan Biography of Spanish Florida*, which will give biographical data of some 700 Spanish Franciscan friars who were connected with the Province of St. Helen in Florida.

Mr. John O'Dea, former national historian of the Ancient Order of Hibernians and editor of the *National Hibernian* from 1924 to 1930, died at Olney, Pa., December 21.

In the death of Mr. Frank Murphy of Baltimore, the Catholic publishing world has lost a representative of the century-old House of John Murphy Company. Mr. Murphy published the *Manual of Prayers* issued after the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884), and that "best seller" among Catholic books the past sixty years — Cardinal Gibbons' *Faith of Our Fathers*.

Georges Goyau, historian and one of the leaders of Catholic thought in France, has been elected perpetual secretary of the French Academy.

Prof. Chang Hsin-lang, head of the department of history at the Catholic University of Peking, has been offered a professorship at Bonn University, Germany. His most important work has been in the field of Sino-Western relations, having published six volumes of documentary materials bearing on the subject.

Progress during the year in the field of microphotographic reproduction of books and manuscripts is recorded in *Microphotography for Libraries, 1937*, edited by M. Llewellyn Raney and published by the American Library Association (pp. 98, planographed). This volume supplements *Microphotography for Libraries*, previously published.

History and Religion, by Archbishop Goodier, S.J., is a collection of the author's essays (Burns, Oates and Washbourne).

Donald Attwater is the editor of *Orbis Catholicus* (Burns, Oates and Washbourne), a reference book to the organization of the Church, with many details also given concerning concordats, diplomatic relations with the Holy See, religious orders, and other matters. For the next few years, at least, reprints will be issued bringing the contents up to date.

A recent French biography that purports to fill in some of the blank spaces between the Old and New Testament is Jacob S. Minkin's *Hérode*, an addition to the "Collection Historique" of Payot. This is a critical biography that paints Herod as a despot, but none the less an excellent colonial administrator. It is published by Edouard Long.

Among the historical books recently published by the Oxford University Press are: *The First Five Centuries of the Christian Church*, by Dr. James Moffatt; and the *Massacre of Saint Bartholomew*, by Dr. Sylvia L. England.

Inquisition and Liberty is Dr. G. G. Coulton's latest book (Heinemann).

The Mediaeval Universities, by Nathan Schachner, tells the story of Salerno, Bologna, Paris, Salamanca, Oxford, Padua, Montpellier, Valladolid, Angers, Heidelberg, and Upsala (F. A. Stokes Co.).

One Thousand Years of Uncertainty is the title of the second volume of Dr. Kenneth S. Latourette's *History of the Expansion of Christianity*. The period covered is from 500 to 1500 A. D. (Harper).

Hilaire Belloc's latest book is a study of *Great Heresies* (Sheed and Ward).

Among the new biographies which have recently appeared or will be published this spring are noted: *Pius XI, Apostle of Peace*, by Lillian Browne-Olf (Macmillan); *Mary, the Mother of Jesus*, by Franz William (B. Herder); *Loyola*, by Ludwig Marcuse (Simon and Schuster); *St. Elizabeth of Portugal*, by Vincent McNabb, O.P. (Sheed and Ward); *St. Catherine of Siena*, by Johannes Jorgensen (Longmans); *Maria Ward*, founder of the teaching Order of St. Omer, by Ida Görres-Coudenhove (Longmans); and *Palestrina*, a new volume in the Master Musicians series, by H. Coates (E. P. Dutton and Co.).

Volume six of Fliche and Martin's *Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours* has been published by Bloud et Gay (Paris) before the fifth volume of the same series has made its appearance. The author of tome six is Emile Amann, professor in the faculty of Catholic theology of Strasburg. The volume is entitled *L'Epoque Carolingienne* (pp. 512).

An unusual religious movement of the latter eighteen-hundreds is the subject of a recent book by Victor Emile Michelet, *Les compagnons de la hiérophanie: souvenirs du mouvement hermétiste à la fin du XIX^e siècle* (Dorbon, aîné).

Among various other items of hagiography recently published in France is Jacques Hérissay's *M. Carmaux. Saint de Bretagne*, one of Bloud et Gay's series "Martyrs de la Révolution."

A Saint under Moslem Rule is an account of St. Eulogius of Córdoba, a martyr of the ninth century, by Justo Pérez de Urbel, translated by a Benedictine of Stanbrook Abbey (Bruce Publishing Co.).

The following articles appear in the January issue of the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique:* " Le symbole du IVe concile de Tolède ", by J. Madoz, S.J.: " Le droit du patronage en Normandie du XIe au XVe siècle (concluded)", by G. Mollat; and " Les lévitations de sainte Brigitte de Suède ", by Pierre Debongnie.

Vol. LV, fasc. 3 and 4, of the *Analecta Bollandiana* contains a contribution on Sainte Théodote de Nicée, by Hippolyte Delehaye; Les notices hispaniques dans le martyrologe d'Usuard, by Baudouin de Gaiffier; Hagiographica celtica (continued), by Paulus Grosjean, S.J.; Gloria postuma S. Martini Turonensis apud Scottos et Britannos, by the same author; and documents listed elsewhere in this section of the REVIEW.

Archiv für Urkundenforschung, which was brought into connection with the new *Deutsches Archiv* and appeared as a new series in 1937, has reverted to its old numbering. *Heft* 1 of the new series is to be considered as the first part of *Band* XV. *Heft* 2 (1938) of that volume contains a lengthy study by B. Schmeidler on the authorship of Berthold's annals. W. Kallert treats the forged documents of the abbey of Weingarten. P. E. Schramm continues his study on the royal coronation ceremonies. The present section deals with the coronation in England. It offers a bibliography and discusses documents from the end of the ninth century to the present day.

With the volume devoted to the 1935 bibliography the *Jahresberichte für deutsche Geschichte* ceased to publish its valuable review of mediaeval Latin. An account of the literature in that field will be presented as formerly in the *Historische Vierteljahrschrift.*

The fourth number of the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* for 1937 carries a brief account by Walter Dress of German research on the history of mediaeval theology during the last five years. An article in the same number by G. Stuhlfauth shows how artists and the arts fell upon evil days in the early period of Lutheranism. Among the other articles there are several on Luther and Lutheranism and one on the fantastic Johann Permeier: Der Primarius der christköniglichen Triumphgesellschaft.

J. Wagner, " Bischof Martin von Tours und seine Glaubensboten im Rheinlande," *Pastor Bonus,* January, 1938, explains the great popularity of Saint Martin in the Rhine valley by the activity of Martin's monks in that

region. There are fifty parish churches dedicated to the saint in the archdiocese of Köln and seventy in the diocese of Trier.

R. Oldenbourg, München and Berlin, announce *München im Mittelalter*, by Dr. Fridolin Sollender; and *Der Aufstieg des Papsttums im Rahmen der Weltgeschichte, 1047-1095*, by Alexander Cartellieri.

Dr. Wilhelm Weber has written *Rom, Herrschertum und Reich im Zweiten Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer).

Ulrich Von Hutten and the German Reformation, by Hajo Holbon, is a biographical study translated from the German (Yale University Press).

With the publication of volume XXXV of the *Enciclopedia Italiana* this monumental enterprise is brought to a conclusion. For the Catholic historian the encyclopedia is most useful, not only for the wealth of topics, admirably treated, in the field of church history, but also for the carefully selected bibliographical references which are given.

Il Libro Italiano is an Italian bibliographical periodical, volume I of which appeared for 1937 in four double numbers, comprising 2408 pages. G. E. Stechert and Co., New York, will supply this volume with its forthcoming index for $12.00; the volume for 1938 for $13.60.

Cardinal Merry del Val, by Msgr. Vigilio Dalpiaz, is an abridgment and translation, by a Benedictine of Stanbrook Abbey, of the official biography written by Monsignor Cenci (Burns, Oates).

We are indebted to His Excellency Dr. Alfred Bilmanis, Latvian Minister to the United States, for the following valuable note by Bishop Rancans on the Revival of an Ancient Metropolis.

"With the introduction of Christianity in the land of the Latvians in the 13th century an extensive ecclesiastical province was established, with the Archbishop of Riga as metropolitan head. In the Middle Ages all believers living in Livonia, Prussia, and part of Lithuania were subject to the Archbishop-Metropolitan of Riga. The first bishops sent to Lithuania were consecrated by this official. In the 16th century this wide jurisdiction suffered a period of collapse: in the long religious wars the old palaces and churches were destroyed, and many of the faithful died of disease and the plague. In place of Riga the bishopric of Cesis was then established; but later, after the Swedish wars, when Roman Catholics remained only in Latgalia and Courland, the diocese of Cesis was replaced by that of Courland or Piltene (also of Livonia). The bishop's seat and cathedral was at Daugavpils. These bishops were to a considerable extent dependent upon Poland or Lithuania. Then, upon the collapse of the united kingdom of Poland

and Lithuania, all Roman Catholic Latvians were subject to the Metropolitan of Russia whose seat was at Monilev and later at Petrograd. When the Russian Empire was overthrown and independent Latvia was created, Latvians of the faith again began to entertain hopes for the revival of the ancient Metropolis of Riga. First the diocese of Riga was erected and a Latvian bishop, His Excellency Anthony Springovics, appointed as its head. With the conclusion of the concordat, in 1923, the ancient archdiocese was restored. Upon the increase of the number of the faithful to 500,000 souls and the entrance into the missionary field of young Latvian priests, trained in the theological university of Riga, the establishment of an independent ecclesiastical province within the territory of free Latvia was considered.

"Thanks to the graciousness of the ruling Pius XI, the willingness of the State, and the favorable agreement of the new apostolic nuncio, Archbishop A. Arata, on May 8th the Archbishopric of Riga was elevated to a Metropolis. Courland and Zemgale have been given a bishopric, with its seat at Liepaja. September 8 the nuncio, Archbishop Arata, proclaimed at the archbishop's palace the appropriate decrees for the future government of Latvian Catholics. Present on this occasion were the Metropolitan Anthony Springovics who will temporarily remain apostolic administrator of the metropolis, Bishops Rancans and Sloskans, Professor H. Albats the Latvian Minister to the Holy See, and all the higher Church officials."

Commenting on the supplementary convention to the Concordat of 1922 which was signed January 25, 1938, by Cardinal Pacelli and Vilhelm Munters, Latvian Minister for Foreign Affairs, the latter expressed himself as follows: "one of the principal purposes of the supplement to the Concordat . . . is to enable the Roman Catholics of Latvia to obtain a higher theological education in their own country. Up to the present time this was impossible as our University did not have a Roman Catholic faculty, the need for which has been felt for some time. Until now a higher Roman Catholic theological education could be gained only by studying in Rome. Next fall the Roman Catholic theological faculty of the University of Latvia will begin to function. We shall take as an example for the organization of this faculty the experience and traditions of the theological universities of Rome. . . . Toward the end of 1936 the Latvian Government sent a special delegation to Rome and an agreement was reached with the Vatican in regard to the statutes of the new faculty. However, as the Concordat of 1922 did not provide for the attainment of a higher theological education in Latvia, it became necessary to supplement the stipulations of the Concordat. At the same time the Concordat had to be conformed to the new conditions created by the bull issued in 1937 by which Latvia was converted into an ecclesiastical province, the Archbishop of Riga raised to the rank of Metropolitan and a new diocese established in Liepaja. . . ."

At the 32d annual meeting of the English Historical Association, held at King's College, London, January 5-8, Mr. Ramsay Muir gave as the annual address the New Era of History; and Prof. D. C. Douglas gave the keynote of a discussion on the Approach to Medieval England.

Financial difficulties have brought to an end the British Society of Franciscan Studies which, since 1908, has contributed much not only to Franciscan lore but to medieval history as well. The society's final volume was *Franciscan History and Legend in English Medieval Art* (1937), edited by Dr. A. G. Little, who since its foundation has been the organization's scholarly editor.

Maisie Ward has been engaged to write the authoritative biography of G. K. Chesterton. She requests the use of letters written by Mr. Chesterton; they should be sent to Mrs. G. K. Chesterton, Top Meadow, Beaconsfield, Bucks., England.

Convocation of the Clergy, by Dorothy B. Weske, presents the story of the development of ecclesiastical assemblies in England from the end of the sixth century to the end of the thirteenth and the rôle these played in the development of the English constitution (S. P. C. K.).

Shakespeare Rediscovered " by means of Public Records, Secret Reports, and Private Correspondence ", by Clara, Countess de Chambrun, is the most recent and satisfactory attempt to prove that the poet lived and died a Catholic (Scribner).

Complaint and Reform in England, 1436-1714, arranged with introductions by Professors William H. Dunham, Jr., and Stanley Pargellis, is a source-book of fifty writings of the time on politics, religion, society, economics, architecture, science, and education (Oxford University Press, pp. 1000).

The Theory of Religious Liberty in England, 1603-39, by T. Lyon, is the Shirlwell Prize Essay for 1937 (Cambridge University Press, Macmillan, pp. 242).

Mrs. Dora H. Robertson has written *Sarum Close,* " a history of the life and education of the Cathedral choristers for 700 years " (Cape).

Saint Cadoc in Cornwall and Brittany, by Canon G. H. Doble, is no. 40 of the Cornish Saint Series (Wendron Vicarage, Cornwall).

Under the direction of the Irish Historical Society (Dublin) and the Ulster Society for Irish Historical Studies (Belfast) a new quarterly periodical with the title *Irish Historical Studies* (Vol. I, no. 1, March, 1938)

has made its appearance. Representatives of both Societies are on the editorial board. Up to the present time there was no historical periodical in Ireland for the whole country. Various learned societies—the Royal Irish Academy, the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society, the Down and Connor Historical Society, the Galway Archaeological Society, and the Louth Archaeological Society—have been in the field for many years and have done much valuable work. But Irish scholars felt the need of a counterpart to the Historical Association and the Institute of Historical Research in England and to the journals of these bodies, *History*, and the *Bulletin* of the Institute. It is of significance that the University of Dublin (Trinity College), the National University of Ireland, and the Queen's University of Belfast have each granted equal subsidy for the costs of the new quarterly. The contents of this first number is attractive to the scholar and to the general reader. Among the contributors are Father J. F. O'Doherty, professor of ecclesiastical history in Maynooth, Hugh Hazlett, and D. A. Chart, who contributes a valuable survey: "The Public Record Office of Northern Ireland (1924-1926)". Professor Moody of the University of Belfast, under the section *Historical Revisions*, gives a new view in "The Treatment of Native Population under the Scheme for the Plantation in Ulster", reaching the conclusion that "the process by which they [the natives] were driven out of the more fertile land and their places taken by British colonists was a gradual one, and was the product of economic forces rather than of any deliberate act on the part of the state" (p. 63). A valuable appendix gives "Writings on Irish History, 1936". *Irish Historical Studies* is published by Messrs. Hodges, Figgis & Co., 20 Nassau Street, Dublin. The annual subscription is 10 shillings, post free.

The *Report of the Public Archives* of the Dominion of Canada for 1936 prints as an appendix a Calendar of State Papers, Upper Canada, 1836-1838 (series G, vols. 76-86)—a continuation of the calendar which appeared in the *Reports* for 1933 and 1935.

The Catholic Press Association of the United States is sponsoring a contest for the best theses on subjects in the field of the Catholic Press in the United States. The prizes will be in the amounts of $300, $250, $200, $150, and $100. All theses must be submitted to the chairman of the Literary Awards Foundation, 813 Southern Finance Bldg., Augusta, Ga., on or before March 1, 1939. They must be prepared in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a graduate degree, must be accepted by the universities to which they are submitted, and must be accompanied by evidence of such acceptance. The studies may be of the Catholic Press in the United States, or of a section, state, diocese, or city, or some other subject which in the opinion of the committee falls within the general field. The

members of the committee are the Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P., Patrick Scanlan, and Richard Reid.

Writings on American History, 1933, compiled by Miss Grace Gardner Griffin and associates, Mrs. Dorothy M. Louraine and Mrs. Katherine M. Tate, appears as the *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association for that year. The *Proceedings* of the Association for 1933 were printed with those of 1934 and 1935 as the *Annual Report* for 1935. In this latest volume of *Writings* there are thirty items referring specifically to Catholic history, listed in the section devoted to Religious History; the index reveals many more topics relating to the Catholic Church, Catholic schools, Catholicism, and Catholics. The compilation is made with the usual completeness and care which characterize the preceding volumes of the series. It is to be hoped, however, that the list will soon be brought closer to date. Its utility would thus be greatly increased.

The *Third Annual Report* of the Archivist of the United States, 1936-1937, is particularly useful for the appended guide to the materials in the archives as of June 30, 1937. The *Report* also gives accounts of the activities during the year of the various divisions of the National Archives.

The annual *List of Doctoral Dissertations in History now in Progress at American Universities* (December 1937) compiled by Mrs. Margaret W. Harrison and issued by the Division of Historical Research of Carnegie Institution of Washington, gives information concerning 1039 topics and candidates. The items are presented according to country with appropriate subdivisions; the use of cross-references shows subjects relating to two or more countries. Indices of authors and of universities are appended. The pamphlet is available to educational and historical organizations, libraries, periodicals in the field of history, and history teachers at universities. The Catholic institutions represented are: Catholic University of America, 28 entries; Fordham, 14; St. Louis University, 9; Boston College, 2; Georgetown, 1. An analysis of this year's *List* shows the usual preference for the field of American history apart from Latin-America; 547 candidates are engaged in research on topics concerned with biographical, political, diplomatic, educational, financial, Indian, legal, military and naval, religious, social, and economic phases of American life. There are fewer "public opinion" subjects; a growing interest in social history is manifest; and biographical topics are on the increase. But the field of historiography still offers possibilities which apparently are becoming scarcer in other phases of history as is shown by some instances in which two or even three students are engaged on the same problem. On the whole the range is wider than usual and questions of greater depth and importance are approached, though the "thin" topic is often to be found as, for example, "An Annotated Bibliography of the Articles in the *Penn-*

sylvania Magazine of History and Biography." Besides the Carnegie *List*, the Association of Research Libraries sponsors *Dissertations Accepted by American Universities* (listing those which have fulfilled this requirement for the doctorate, few of which are printed), and the Library of Congress prints an annual bibliography of dissertations in all fields of study which have been printed each year. Many universities, also, publish abstracts of theses submitted at the respective institutions.

The H. W. Wilson Company (950-972 University Avenue, New York City) has issued a *Union List of Newspapers in Libraries of the United States and Canada*, which has been edited by Winifred Gregory in a format similar to her *Union List of Serials*, although the arrangement is geographical and not alphabetical. *The Union List of Newspapers* begins with the year 1821 and runs on to 1936 inclusive. The same company has recently published *Bibliographies in American History*, by Henry Putney Beers (pp. 339, $3.50), which provides an index to bibliographical materials on every aspect of the political, economic, and social history of the United States.

On and Off the Campus, by Dean Guy Stanton Ford, retiring president of the American Historical Association, is a collection of papers to be published in May (University of Minnesota Press), in celebration of the author's twenty-fifth anniversary as head of the Graduate School of the university. Included will be his presidential address and his several papers on educational and historical topics; among the latter will be one on Wöllner and the Prussian Religious Edict of 1788.

Dr. Jeanette P. Nichols, who is engaged in writing a Life of John Sherman, appeals to all who may have letters signed by Sherman to write her (Deck 37, Room 24, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.).

A report, written in Latin, by the Reverend Dr. P. J. Lyden of Menlo Park, concerning the status of the Catholic Church in the United States was published in *Jus Pontificium*, 1937 (pp. 162-173). As might be expected, European reviews find these statistics interesting and are commenting on the article.

As a supplement to the December number of the *Bulletin de l'Institut Français de Washington*, John F. McDermott of Washington University, St. Louis, supplies a study of Private Libraries in Creole Saint-Louis (pp. 15-95), an interesting sidelight on French life and culture in that city in the eighteenth century. The first part presents a description of cultural conditions on the confines of a wilderness; in part II some 38 private libraries (1764-1804) are examined in detail and a biographical note given of each owner. The largest library listed is that of Pierre LaClede, the

principal citizen of the town in 1778. The catalogue of the books of Father Pierre Joseph Didier, Benedictine, shows interest in theology, history, and medicine.

Church History for December offers a study of Robert Browne, Independent, by Dwight C. Smith; and an account of the Rise of Monasticism in the Church of Africa, by R. Pierce Beaver.

The *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* for December prints the first part of a study of Catholic Exploration of the Far West, 1794-1835, by Ara Timourian; an anonymous appreciation of Kateri Tekakwitha; and a sketch of Father Stommel, "Church Builder", by Monsignor Leo G. Fink.

Articles in the January issue of *Mid-America* concern: Pueblo Founding in Early Mexico, by Catherine M. McShane; the Observance of the Marquette Tercentenary, by Arthur J. O'Dea; Marquette's Title to Fame, by Gilbert J. Garraghan; and William Howlett, Pioneer Missionary and Historian, first instalment, by Thomas F. O'Connor.

In the *Historical Bulletin* for January will be found a characterization of De Tocqueville as a Disillusioned Liberal, by Paul R. Conroy; the story of Archbishop Hughes's mission to European courts during the Civil War, under the title, "A Priest in Politics", by John B. McGloin; a study of Orestes A. Brownson, being the first of a series on great Catholic laymen, by Joseph R. Frese; the second part of Gerald P. Brennan's guide to High School History Teaching; and a discussion of Communal Movement *vs.* Feudalism, by Edmund J. Stumpf. In the March issue Father Gilbert J. Garraghan discusses Legend as an Historical Source; Pedro Leturia writes of Saint Pius the Fifth (to be continued); Donald A. Gallagher, on Saint Louis, the Just King; and Marie R. Madden offers some suggestions on Questioning in History Teaching.

The *Official Report* of the Catholic Central-Verein of America (the national federation of German American Catholics) for 1937 has recently been issued from its headquarters in St. Louis. The *Report* contains the proceedings of the eighty-second annual convention. The next annual sessions will be held at Bethlehem, Penna., in August, 1938.

Printed in English and in Bohemian the *Golden Memories: Church of Our Lady of Perpetual Help (1887-1937)*, New York City, from the pen of the national Redemptorist historian, Father John F. Byrne, this parochial history stands apart from the usual jubilee volume in that we are given a clear insight into the problems of language and of race which the priests of the parish had to solve up until almost our own day.

An elaborate programme of the commemoration of the *Centennial of the Establishment of the Archdiocese of Dubuque, Iowa*, has been issued, which contains portraits in color of the bishops and archbishops who have ruled over the see, several contributions of historical interest, and a calendar of events.

The *Souvenir* of the centennial (1837-1937) of the parish of Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana, recently published by Rev. Dr. Fintan G. Walker, a graduate of the Catholic University of America, is an exceptionally well-written parochial history and is made very attractive by the reproduction of facsimiles of the old baptismal and matrimonial registers and journals.

Robert Bleichsteiner, professor at the University of Vienna, is the author of a volume that will be found available for the comparative study of religions. It is *L'église jaune*, "Collection Historique", (Payot). Bleichsteiner's work deals with Tibet and Mongolia, and with the religions in vogue there. The author discusses the political structure and population of those areas, the history of Lamaism, the Dalai Lamas and the Mongol Khans, convents and monks, rites and feasts, magic arts, and various other topics necessary to an understanding of the peculiar politico-religious structure of society in that part of the world.

Valuable new material for the history of the Church in the Far East may be found in a series of French publications of the Institut des Hautes Etudes de Tientsin. Paul Geuthner (Paris) recently announced the publication of the first six items in this series. All are written by Rev. Henri Bernard. Their titles, given in order of publication are: *Sagesse chinoise et philosophie chrétienne: Essai sur leurs relations historique* (pp. 283); *Le découverte de Nestoriens et l'histoire ancienne du christianisme en Extrême-Orient* (pp. 75); *Aux portes de la Chine: Les Missionnaires du XVI^e siècle (1514-1588)* (pp. 284); *Le frère Bento de Goes: chez les Musulmans de la Haute Asie (1603-1607)* (pp. 167); *Aux origines du cimetière de Chala: Le don princier de la Chine au Père Ricci (1610-1611)* (pp. 55); *L'apport scientifique du Père Mathieu Ricci à la Chine* (pp. 89); *Les îles Philippines du grand archipel de la China: un essai de conquête spirituelle de l'Extrême-Orient (1571-1641)* (pp. 230).

The Saints of Egypt, by De Lacy O'Leary, deals with the Church of Alexandria, the sources for the lives of saints, and studies of martyrs and Egyptian monasticism.

Documents. Account of the First Jesuit Missionary Journey across the Plains to Santa Fe (1867), J. Manuel Espinosa (*Mid-America*, January); Educational Ideas and Plans of the Rev. Caspar Rehrl, Peter L. Johnson (*Salesianum*, January); Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum latinorum

Paderbornensium et Osnabrugensium, Franciscum Halkin (*Analecta Bollandiana*, LV, fasc. 3 and 4); Un sermon inédit de Rupert, abbé de Deutz, sur S. Pantaléon, Maurice Coens (*ibid.*); The Chapter Elections in 1672, Lansing B. Bloom and Lynn B. Mitchell (*New Mexico Historical Review*, January); Un catalogo inedito dei XV o XVI primi Superiori Generali dei Minori Cappuccini, M. da Pobladura, O.M.Cap. (*Collectanea Franciscana*, January); Un touriste du Chile au Canada en 1583: Don Benjamin Vicuna-Mackenna, Armand Yon (*Canada Français*, February); The *Ark* and the *Dove:* Transcripts from the Public Record Office, London, Raphael Semmes (*Maryland Historical Magazine*, March); The Calendar of the Augustine Priory of Launceston in Cornwall, F. Wormald (*Journal of Theological Studies*, January); L'ordre des parties dans le Traité de Paulin d'Aquilée contre Félix d'Urgel, A. Wilmart, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Anniversaries. 25th: St. Mary's, Palmyra, Wis.; Our Lady of Lourdes, Atlanta, Ga. (*Bulletin*, Dec. 21); Incarnate Word College, San Antonio, Tex. *50th:* St. Alphonsus parish, Baltimore, Md.; St. Francis de Sales parish, Newark, Ohio; St. Rose's, Milwaukee, Wis.; *75th:* Boston College, Boston, Mass.; St. Mary's College, Calif.; Belgian Missionary Congregation of Scheut. *100th:* St. Anne's, Sumter, S. C. (*Bulletin*, Dec. 21); Cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, Mobile, Ala.; celebration of the first Mass in the State of Washington; birth of Faith in New Zealand.

BRIEF NOTICES

ABBOT, WILBUR CORTEZ, *Adventures in Reputation with an Essay on Some "New" History and Historians.* (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1935, pp. 264, $2.50.) This is a collection of historical essays by a mature historian who writes with the wisdom of vast experience. The essays have style and abundant humor. The contents of the volume are extremely varied. There are two essays in English historiography on Macaulay and Hume. Mr. Abbot is fond of the former. Three papers show why Lord Chesterfield, Queen Victoria, and Oliver Cromwell attained fame. In the American field James Bloxham, brought over from England to manage the farms of George Washington, is rescued from oblivion, and the short-lived history of the town of Lecompton as the capital of Kansas is recounted. The essay entitled "Some 'New' History and Historians" will make the serious student of history chuckle as the author chastises the schools of writing represented by Ferrero, Robinson, Barnes, Wells, Belloc, Guedella, Strachey, and the popular biographers such as Ludwig. This last essay as well as several of the others had been published previously. The attractively printed volume would make pleasant but thought-provoking reading for a vacation. (A. K. ZIEGLER.)

BIONDO BIONDI, GIUSTINIANO, *Primo Principe et Legislatore Cattolico* (*Pubblicazioni della Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Serie seconda: Scienze Giuridiche,* vol. XLVIII. Milano, Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, 1936, pp. 190.) This monograph is a development of a paper delivered in Rome in 1934 in connection with the celebration of the fourteen-hundredth anniversary of the publication of Justinian's Code. Professor Biondi's conclusion is this: "the religious trait is the most characteristic and essential trait in Justinian's rule, the fundamental character of all his legislation is Christian, and Justinian is essentially a Catholic prince and legislator." He has studied thoroughly the legislation of Justinian, the modern literature bearing upon it, and the political and religious history of the fifth and sixth centuries. His well-documented monograph has the merit of focusing attention on the Christian elements in Justinian's legislation, and of presenting the relations between Justinian and the Holy See from a somewhat new aspect. But in spite of his ingenious argumentation, the conduct of the emperor in the affair of the Three Chapters cannot be explained away, and, in the light of Justinian's Monophysite tendencies, I do not see how he can be called *un Principe fervidamente cattolico.* Professor Biondi has written an interesting study, but on essential points he has not succeeded in changing the generally accepted view of Justinian's religious policy and legislation. The monograph, unfortunately, has no index. (M. R. P. MCGUIRE.)

BORN, LESTER K., *The Education of a Christian Prince by Desiderius Erasmus, Translated with an Introduction on Erasmus and on Ancient and Medieval Political Thought. (Records of Civilization Sources and Studies, Number xxvii).* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1936, pp. 277.) This work is one of the better contributions to the *Records of Civilization.* The long introduction (pp. 1-130) contains a good treatment of the political theories of Erasmus, an analysis of the contents of the *Education of a Christian Prince,* a sketch of the ancient theories of statecraft, a systematic account of the ancient sources employed by Erasmus in his treatise, and a good survey of the treatment of the perfect prince in the literature from the sixth to the sixteenth century. The translation, the first complete version in English, is accurate and readable. The book is furnished with a valuable bibiliography and with an adequate index. (M. R. P. MCGUIRE.)

CLEMENCE, STELLA R. (Transl. and Ed.), *The Harkness Collection in the Library of Congress: Documents from Early Peru — the Pizarros and the Almagros, 1531-1578.* (Washington, United States Government Printing Office, 1936, pp. xi, 253.) As announced in the Preface, this volume is "the second in the series of publications made by the Library of Congress from the great collection of early Spanish manuscripts concerning the New World, presented to it in 1926 by Mr. Edward S. Harkness." The volume contains the original text and an English translation of forty-eight documents of the collection which bear directly on the Pizarros and the Almagros and which on this account were thought to be of special importance and interest to students of Hispanic American history. While the Church historian will miss a number of ecclesiastical documents calendared in the first volume (published in 1932) of the series, the forty-eight here offered shed abundant light on the political, economic and social conditions in Peru between the stirring years 1531 and 1545. The copious "Notes to English Text" (pp. 215-239), like the transcriptions and translations, are the work of Miss Stella R. Clemence of the Library of Congress, a recognized authority on Peruvian history. Like her first volume, this second also merits high praise and commendation for the fine scholarship it manifests. Future writers on the secular history of early Peru will find rich materials in this new source of information. Like its predecessor, the volume is handsomely printed on durable paper and by reason of its attractive binding will prove an ornament on the shelves of the historian. The promised third volume of the series, we hope, will be as valuable and beautiful as the two now published. (FRANCIS BORGIA STECK.)

COSTIL, PIERRE, *André Dudith, humaniste hongrois, 1533-89, sa vie et ses manuscrits grecs.* (Paris, Société d'édition "Les belles lettres," 1935, pp. 261.) This the story of André Dudith, Hungarian humanist, theologian and philologer, scholar and diplomat, disciple of Turnèbe, a reputed Ciceronian, poet occasionally, secretary of a papal delegate in England, orator at the Council of Trent, counsellor of three emperors, internuncio in Poland, apostate bishop, married, excommunicated by Rome, suspect to the Reformers, inclined to Socinianism, versed in several languages, an elegant translator, and amateur of jurisprudence and of the history of medicine and astronomy. Such a com-

plex character naturally appeals more to the student of the history of thought during the second half of the sixteenth century than to the historian of classical philology. But as a philologist Dudith acted as a liaison officer between international circles of scholars. By careful consultation of the correspondence of Paolo Manuzio, completed by other sources, Costil has reconstructed in a vivid manner the milieu in which Dudith lived. He quotes an interesting letter in which Paolo Manuizio recommends Dudith to Guido Panciroli, professor of law at Padua, he introduces other figures of Italian humanists, such as Marco Antonio Passera da Genova, and the luminaries at whose feet Dudith sat: Robertello, Sigonio, Pietro Vettori, Onofrio Panvinio and Gian Vincenzo Pinelli, he points out the new spirit animating Paduan scholarship at the time of Dudith's sojourn there, *i. e.*, the curiosity about methodological questions, and the trend towards positive research in *realia*, enlightening the study of the texts. He also gives an interesting account of the colony of Polish and Hungarian students at the University of Padua. The importance of Costil's book consists in the information it adds to what was already known, from the works of Voigt, from the monograph of J. Langlade on John Kochanowski (Paris, 1932), and from an article by Coloman Juhász (in the *Historisches Jahrbuch*, vol. 55, 1935, pp. 55-74), about the influence exerted by the Italian Renaissance on Polish intellectual life. In the appendix he publishes for the first time some letters of Dudith, contained in the so-called *codex Rhedigerianus*, 253, a part of the *Rhedigerische Briefsammlung* preserved in the Stadtbibliothek of Breslau. This enables us to form a close-range acquaintance with the mental *pabulum* which he sought, as well as with his writings and his friends. (Elio Gianturco.)

Culver, Dorothy Campbell, *Methodology of Social Science Research: A Bibliography*. Publication of the Bureau of Public Administration University of California. (Berkeley, University of California Press, 1936, pp. x, 159, $2.00.) This publication will be found extremely useful by those teaching and carrying on research in the social sciences, since it provides a selected and annotated guide to studies of methods and techniques used in research in this broad field. The volume reports on 1509 selections made from materials published in English since 1920. It excludes the fields of psychology and education with the exception of general handbooks on method. The material is arranged in a logical manner in the order of the steps of a research problem, as follows: Selection and Definition of Problem, Sources of Material, Collection of Data, Techniques of Analysis and Interpretation of Data, and Preparation of Manuscript. An additional section deals with methodology of special fields. Ready accessibility to individual items is given by the author and there are subject indexes. (Mary Elizabeth Walsh.)

David, Charles Wendell, *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi (The Conquest of Lisbon)*. Edited from the Unique Manuscript in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, with a Translation into English. [Columbia Univ. Records of Civilization, number XXIV.] (New York, Columbia University Press, 1936, pp. x, 201, $3.75.) Professor David, long known for his volume on Robert

Curthose, gives us the definitive edition of the *De Expugnatione Lyxbonensi* together with a highly accurate translation. A new edition of this precious source, which recounts the sole success of the second crusade, was badly needed. Justice had not previously been done to the unique manuscript containing it. This expedition in 1147 of "lesser folk", who were interested in the gainful as well as the religious aspects of a crusade, who were able to act together in an organized way and govern themselves, left a history of such general interest that it richly deserves translation. The text is preceded by a masterly introduction and accompanied by annotations that leave nothing to be desired. The author of this interesting little memoir was evidently a priest who accompanied the expedition and wrote his account before leaving Lisbon. The extant manuscript is presumably not his autograph, but appears to have been written *c.* 1175. Professor David is unable to give any more precise information on the name of the author than appeared in his discussion of the subject in *Speculum*. Probably only a chance discovery will even identify him. The old attribution to Osbern has no justification. The spelling of the manuscript is usually reproduced in the edition, so that the mediaeval flavor of the by no means Ciceronian Latin is happily preserved. The King James version is used in the translation of the biblical quotations. There are maps, a brief glossary, an index, and a facsimile of the first page of the manuscript. (A. K. ZIEGLER.)

DEINHARDT, W., *Dedicationes Bambergenses ... Weihenotizen und -urkunden aus dem mittelalterlichen Bistum Bamberg.* (Freiburg, B. Herder, 1936, pp. xv, 133, $2.50.) An extensive introduction by the editor dwells on the importance which medieval Catholics attributed to such ecclesiastical functions as the dedications of church buildings. In the minds of the contemporaries they loomed as prominent historical events, the significance of which was greatly enhanced by the gathering of high dignitaries. Moreover, celebrations of this kind and their anniversaries became popular holidays, much enjoyed by the people, and welcome as pleasant relief from the routine of daily toil. Hence, besides having a cultural interest these records afford information on the inner history of dioceses and monasteries and bring to the notice of posterity outstanding personages of the time. The history of art likewise draws heavily on them for information bearing on minute details of architectural construction. Hagiography and liturgy also owe much to them since they frequently enter into instructive discussions concerning saints and the authenticity of their relics. The collection of documents in question covers a period of about 530 years extending from 1007 to 1530. It contains dedicatory inscriptions, commemorative tablets, lists of indulgences granted, documents relative to the foundation and endowment of institutions and official certificates of rites performed. The character of the documents vouches for their historical reliability. They may rightly be regarded as first-hand information and original sources from which the historian may safely derive his conclusions. Since this is the case, the editor has rendered a real service to the history of the Diocese of Bamberg in particular and helped to promote a fuller knowledge of medieval liturgical practice in general. The edition represents a fine piece of painstaking and conscientious research work. (H. T. BRUEHL.)

DE LA RONCIÈRE, CHARLES, *Au fil du Mississipi avec le Père Marquette.* (Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1935, pp. 192.) This is a popular volume in the collection "La Grande Aventure." Though giving no specific references to the sources, the author quotes extensively from contemporary accounts, particularly the *Jesuit Relations.* The back cover consists of a facsimile of what is apparently Thevenot's map of 1681. The brief bibliography gives evidence of the author's acquaintance with the more recent Marquette literature; his rendition of the title of the Thwaites edition of the *Relations* is undoubtedly the result of an oversight. (THOMAS F. O'CONNOR.)

FESSARD, GASTON, *Pax Nostra: Examen de Conscience International.* (Paris, Editions Bernard Grasset, 1936, pp. xx, 460, 18fr.) This timely and instructive French volume, covering 460 pages, is a challenge to Catholics to reflect carefully before taking a position on the many complex problems arising within and between nations today and to see to it that this position is compatible with Catholic doctrine. The author, anxious to reconcile first in himself the love of world peace which inspires the pacifist, and the love of country which the nationalist invokes, defines his attitude by orienting it toward Christ Who, in reconciling men among themselves and with God, is, in the words of St. Paul, "Our Peace." After an analysis of "la personne" who discovers in the human person the need of a Community of Nations, two chapters place the role of Justice and of Charity on the international plan. Is the letter of a treaty sufficient to determine the justice of a cause? On what conditions does the appeal to the spirit of a pact justify contrary claims? If justice is not sufficient to establish justice and peace, may one speak of charity among nations? And since non-resistance to evil has its logical place in the precept of charity, what distinguishes that of the Christian from that which integral pacificism vaunts? There is no need to underline the present importance of these questions. That charity is the law of nations as well as that of individuals, the author believes and affirms to the point of asking if a nation cannot or even should not practice non-resistance toward the unjust aggressor. This hypothesis he does not fear to face but endeavors to bring an answer to it. Besides, the scope of the internationalist movement obliges him to question himself on the very foundations of the idea of country. Is it not destined, he asks, to reabsorb itself and disappear under the mounting sea of socialism and communism? Forced by this situation to approach the study of capitalism and of internationalism, he attacks it from the angle which has roused most passions: the Jewish problem. Relying on history as well as on principles, he endeavors to bring to light the profound relations which ordinarily escape those who are preoccupied with the moving present.

Written in a style deliberately devoid of any technical expression, this book contains in reality an outline of an original Christian philosophy: on one side the Pauline opposition of the Jew and the pagan forms a continuous chain throughout the volume, while on the other side the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ constitutes the point of departure and of completion of this analysis. The problems of political and juridical philosophy, which such reflections suggest, are approached in two appendices, one of which exposes the

relations of the nation and of the state, in the case of national minorities, while the other treats of the relations of political science with morality. A current of profound human and Christian sympathy runs through all these analyses of questions, which are at the same time questions of the present time and of the future. Those who are not convinced of the author's view cannot, however, remain insensible to the ideas expressed in this work. (E. B. SWEENEY.)

Franciscan History of North America. Report of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference. (Brookland, Washington, D. C., 1936, pp. lii, 385.) The report of the 1936 meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference, held at Mission Santa Barbara, California, should prove of particular interest and value to American historical scholars. The several papers presented at the Conference were concerned with one or other aspect of the history of the sons of St. Francis in North America. Their publication in the present form renders the *Report* the most serviceable handbook of the Franciscan historiography of North America available in English. Some of the foremost historical scholars of the American and Canadian provinces of the three autonomous Franciscan families have given of their time and labor to make the volume a work of substantial service to all interested in Franciscan activities north of Mexico. Members of the historical profession will undoubtedly agree that the most significant service accomplished by the various contributors consists in the excellent treatment of the sources of American Franciscan history which characterizes a number of the papers. In this respect the contributions of Fathers Lenhart and Lemay are deserving of particular commendation. Father Lenhart's paper, "Franciscan Historians of North America," provides students of early American history with the introduction to Franciscan historical writing on North America which they have long sought. It is distinguished by the scholarship and erudition we have become accustomed to expect from this learned and tireless worker. Father Lemay's "The Friars Minor in French and British North America," in its ample and scholarly discussion of the sources for the history of the Recollects in Canada, indicates the avenues of approach to a field of investigation which, to the majority of American scholars, at least, has hitherto been a *terra incognita*. Father Pohlkamp's résumé of the work of the "Spanish Franciscans in the Southeast," will prove invaluable as a guide to those interested in the further study of one of the lesser known phases of the Friars' American activity. (THOMAS F. O'CONNOR.)

GROCE, GEORGE C., JR., *William Samuel Johnson: A Maker of the Constitution.* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1937, pp. xi, 227, $2.75.) It is not to be inferred from the secondary title of this work that the study is chiefly of Johnson's share in the framing of the Constitution and the establishment of the government under it; for only thirty-six pages are devoted to those two phases of his career. The work is, in fact, a meticulous study of Johnson's whole life, from the cradle to the grave. It is, nevertheless, true of Johnson, as it is of most of the framers of the Constitution, that his equipment for the task and his attitudes toward measures distinctly point back to his prior training and experience.

Born in 1727, Johnson's active life, intimately interwoven into the formative years of our national history, stretched across the last half of the eighteenth century, and a paling shadow of the man crept on through a further nineteen years of the succeeding century. Son of an Anglican divine laboring in the vineyard of Stratford, Connecticut, where Anglicans were few and Puritanism abounded he was piously reared in the Anglican faith and in almost as pious a devotion to the best European culture. Though gently pushed by his father, the Rev. Samuel Johnson, toward the ministry and though, like Jacob at Peniel, he wrestled with the Great Awakening, in the end he turned to the law. Throughout his life, nevertheless, his affections clung tenaciously to the institution of the Episcopal Church. Having obtained his bachelor's degree at Yale at the age of seventeen and his master's degree at the age of twenty, within ten years he had attained a measure of that success that was ultimately to bring him the title of "Father of the Connecticut Bar". Naturally he became involved in the colonial politics of his time, the woof of which was a confused intermingling of religious with political threads, and in 1760 he put his foot upon the first rung of the political ladder, as selectman of Stratford. Other rungs—deputy in the General Assembly, member of the Council, judge of the Superior Court, delegate to Congress, delegate to the Federal Convention, United States Senator—were mounted from time to time, although once or twice his foot slipped. In 1765 his voice was heard in the general chorus of "Stamps and Slavery", and he was sent as a delegate to the Stamp-Act Congress. From 1767 to 1771, he served as special agent for Connecticut in London in the matter of some troublesome land titles, acquiring in consequence a close-up view of the developing colonial controversy and a polishing of his "political and diplomatic technique". He took occasion, during visits to Paris and Amsterdam, to attend Catholic services and was impressed with the rich vestments and "august appearance" of the clergy and by the "solemn and noble" ritual; but he also found what he looked upon as somewhat of the ridiculous in the ceremonies. At the outbreak of the Revolution his "political technique" appears to have overreached itself; for, out of a characteristic caution, he declined appointment to the First Continental Congress, and thereafter, as doubt followed doubt amongst his fellow-citizens, a cloud of suspicion gathered about him, not to be dispersed until the Revolution was over. In fact, he was chosen as a delegate to Congress in 1784 primarily for his knowledge of the Susquehanna land affair and for his skill as a lawyer. He served his state so well that his delegation to the Federal Convention, and his subsequent election as one of the state's first Senators, followed almost as a matter of course. The presidency of Columbia University (1787-1800) fittingly rounded out his notable career.

Summing up Johnson's career, the author declares, "his whole life was a quest for harmony and peace. Between Old Light and New Light, between England and America, between Connecticut and Pennsylvania, between North and South, between the past as represented by the old Confederation, and the future as forecast in the new Constitution, he helped to bring about a new order, understanding and good will". Utilizing every available scrap of information concerning Johnson, Mr. Groce has admirably succeeded in giving substance to what had before been but a shadow. (EDMUND C. BURNETT.)

HAIMAN, MIECISLAUS, *The Poles in the Early History of Texas.* Annals of the Polish Roman Catholic Union Archive and Museum, vol. I. (1936, pp. 64.) This volume of 64 pages is divided as follows: I, First Poles in Texas; II, The Poles in the War with Mexico; III, The Conclusion. In this treatise are to be found the names and locations of Polish settlements in Texas and the territorial origin and the records of the most outstanding of the settlers. Due credit is given the man who established the first permanent Polish settlement in the United States, Father Leopold Moczgemba, a Franciscan friar. The families in this group numbered about one hundred. They landed at Galveston in 1854 and later settled in Karnes County and founded the village of Panna Maria. The volume contains valuable information relative to the several Polish emigrations to the United States. (WILLIAM F. BLAKESLEE.)

HUBBART, HENRY C., *The Older Middle West, 1840–1880.* (New York, D. Appleton Century Co., Inc., 1936, pp. ix, 305.) The Older Middle West early developed characteristics by which it differed from the rest of the nation; but it did not contain a homogeneous population. Both population origins and economic necessity tended to link the southern counties of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois with the South in sympathy and interest. On the contrary, the northern counties had more in common, culturally and economically, with the industrial East than with the southern counties of their own states. These sectional differences were so pronounced that when in the campaign of 1860, these states became the political center of the United States, the results of the election and the course of our national history came to depend in a great measure on the political outcome in a few doubtful middle counties. The community and dissimilarity of interest of these two sections determined in no small measure,—not only regionally, but nationally,—the course of events, as the country strove to meet the problems of slavery, of expansion, and of war. Professor Hubbart in this work published for the American Historical Association successfully pictures for us the whole region through forty turbulent years, but he especially concentrates his attention on the social, political, economic and cultural life of the counties along the Ohio river. From a maze of newspaper, periodical, memoir, epistolary, monograph, and other published and unpublished material he has put together a faithful picture of an important region and period. The result has been a valuable and interesting contribution to the sectional and general history of the United States. Though the great part of the work is taken up with the political controversies of that ultra-political age, the author gives full space to the social and economic factors involved. In his treatment of religious life, however, Catholic influence and growth is little more than mentioned. The work has an extensive bibliography, and an index. (HAROLD J. BOLTON.)

HOLTZMANN, WALTHER, *Papsturkunden in England. 2 Band: Die kirchlichen Archive und Bibliotheken. I. Berichte und Handschriftenbeschreibungen. II. Texte.* Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl. Dritte Folge, nr. 14-15. (Berlin, Wiedmann, 1935-

1936, pp. 488.) The first volume of this work was reviewed in detail in the *Catholic Historical Review*, XVIII (1932-1933), 525-526, and so it will be sufficient here to characterize the second volume briefly. The same general plan adopted in Volume I has been followed, i.e., Part I contains a description of places and collections of documents in which papal letters, or references to them were discovered, and Part II contains the texts of such letters as are not mentioned at all in Jaffe-Löwenfeld or were known to these scholars only through the manuscript tradition. The following episcopal letters were examined for the material presented: Canterbury, Rochester, Norwich, Chichester, Winchester, Salisbury, Exeter, Wells, Hereford, Worcester, Lichfield, Lincoln, Ely, Peterborough, York, Southwell and Durham. The invaluable help furnished by the episcopal registers is emphasized. Throughout Part I there is a personal note in the accounts of visits to the old cathedral towns of England and in the descriptions of collections, especially of neglected collections, which gives an interest and charm to an exposition that, otherwise, would be necessarily monotonous and dry. Of the 292 documents published in Part II of the second volume only 16 are originals, but this is not surprising in view of the fate of the ecclesiastical archives of England in the Reformation Period. (See Holtzmann, *Papsturkunden in England*, 1. Band I, pp. 1-27.) The present work exhibits the same high standard of scholarship which characterized Volume I. Let us hope that Professor Holtzmann will be able to bring out the third and final volume in the near future. This will comprise the material from Oxford and Cambridge and from private archives together with whatever London materials are not included in Volume I. (M. R. P. McGuire.)

Johnson, Charles S., Edwin R. Embree and W. W. Alexander, *The Collapse of Cotton Tenancy, Summary of Field Studies and Statistical Surveys, 1933-1935*. (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1935, pp. ix, 81, $1.00.) This little book is a summary of an intensive study of farm tenancy among cotton growers in the Old South. It points out the evils of the prevailing credit system, the wastes of the one-crop system from soil depletion, the weakness of the A.A.A. program in meeting the tenant situation, and the need of further provision for rural rehabilitation in the South. One of the authors, Mr. Alexander, is now Administrator of the Farm Security Administration in the U. S. Department of Agriculture, created in September, 1937, to take over the work of the Resettlement Administration and to carry out the tenant aid and rural rehabilitation programs of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. (F. O'Hara.)

Lindworski, Johannes, S.J., *The Psychology of Asceticism*. (London, H. W. Edwards, 1936, pp. 95, 5/.) Father Lindworski has written a very handy little book but with much too ambitious a title. The aim of the work is to make some contribution to the problem of ascetical training from the findings of modern experimental psychology; that it does, and nothing more. Much of the value of the book lies in its translation of age-old practises into the technical phraseology of the moderns. It is no surprise to the student familiar with Father Lindworski to find the scholastic doctrine of habits

tossed bodily out the window. A serious defect in the make-up of the book is the complete absence of a table of contents, indexes, summaries. (W. F.)

LOIANO, P. SERAPHINUS, O.M.Cap., *Institutiones Theologiae Moralia.* Vol. I: *Theologia Fundamentalis.* (Torino, Marietti, 1934, pp. vii, 492.) This posthumous work, edited by Father Maurus a Grizzana, is the first of a series of four volumes, which will cover the entire field of Moral Theology. It is not particularly original in the manner of presentation, and the bibliography seems to be restricted to books in Latin and in Italian. Reference is frequently made to Antonelli's *Medicina Pastoralis* which is outmoded on many points. Readers, however, will find a complete discussion of problems written in simple Latin and conspicuous for logical arrangement. The printing is commendable. To mention but one point of detail, the author defends Probabilism. (J. F. F.)

MATHER, FRANK JEWETT, JR., *Venetian Painters.* (New York, Holt and Company, 1936, pp. xxviii, 497, $5.00.) Venice must always be of interest to the medieval historian who now may read with value this thorough study of Venetian painting. The circumstances which made for its characteristic colorfulness, gravity and moderation are pointed out, as also the elements that set it apart from the work of the Florentine and Roman schools. The life and background of practically all the important masters are recounted, their work critically evaluated, their interrelation noted. Whole chapters are devoted to Carpaccio, to Giovanni Bellini, to Gorgione. There is a "little book," three chapters on Titian, "the most classic of the Italian painters." To Tintoretto, "the most Michelangelesque of the Venetians," and to Paolo Veronese, "the stabilizer of the Venetian school", chapters are also allotted, and shorter notices are given to a host of others such as Tiepolo, "who probably did more painting with his own hand than any artist on record." The author is entirely in sympathy with his subjects and their milieu, one even suspects with their pragmatism. The book is admirably well written, and though the treatment is strictly historical and critical, it is interesting and instructive throughout. (E. C. D.)

METZGER, JOSEPH, *Das Katholische Schrifttum im heutigen England.* (München: Kösel-Pustet, 1937, pp. xvi, 407.) This work gives a full account of contemporary Catholic literary activity in Great Britain and Ireland, together with a penetrating study of its historical background. It dates both the authors and their principal works with accuracy, and gives numerous and sometimes extensive selections from the Catholic poets, and quotations from English and American critics. These citations are in English. Father Stephen J. Brown, S.J., in his *Libraries and Literature from a Catholic Standpoint,* calls this "a sympathetic and well-informed study seen from a German Catholic standpoint." It is, moreover, an up-to-date and firsthand study, the fruit of intensive research carried on by the author in England, where he had all the advantages of the British Museum and of many personal contacts. From the nature of the work it is impossible to give a detailed account of its contents.

The author was perhaps too ambitious in his purpose to be able to do full justice to everything that falls under his scrutiny. He does not content himself with studying only the leading authors, nor does he limit himself to studying what goes commonly by the name of belles-lettres. *Katholische Literatur* for him is any writing imbued with the Catholic spirit: "Schrifttum von katholischer Weltanschauung durchdrungen". Accordingly, there are separate sections for poetry, essays, history and biography, art and science (under this heading may be found also literary criticism, bibliography, philosophy, theology and devotion); then there follows a large section devoted to novels; then briefer sections for the drama and journalism. Nevertheless, literature proper holds first place in the author's scheme. Apologetics and polemics are treated incidentally.

The time limit is not tightly drawn, *e.g.*, although the Oxford Movement is considered the beginning of the Catholic revival, yet the author permits himself excursions into the literary life prior to this movement. In this way the author gives a fairly accurate outline of the literary history of Catholic thought in England since the days of the Reformation.

Neither is there a narrowness as regards the subject-matter. Catholic authors and their tendencies are frequently compared with non-Catholic writers of prominence, and even America is not outside the vision of the author. The best known of these is Francis Marion Crawford, who, by the way, was not born in America, as the author states, but in Italy. This, again, leads to another consideration. The work broadens out to embrace not only any writer of some note who was or who became a Catholic, though their works might lack the Catholic note, but also those works of converts which antedated their conversion. An instance of this, one out of many, is William Hurrell Mallock, the famed author of *Is Life Worth Living*, who became a Catholic on his deathbed, yet whose works are included in this history of Catholic literature. Although this may be an inconsistency, it is a fortunate one, in that the work does not consist in the critique of individual persons or writings, but in the vast range of its information, which a twelve-page, double-columed index of names (and names only) makes easy of access.

As might be expected in a work printed in Germany, there are many mistakes in the spelling of English words, sometimes even of the proper names of persons, and these are not all corrected in the list of errata with which the book closes.

One impression stands out prominently after studying this work: the Catholic literary revival in England is largely an importation, coming in with the inflow of converts and being kept up by this continuous influx into the Church from the Establishment. (A. BELLWALD.)

MONTAGUE, F. C., *The Elements of English Constitutional History.* (New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1936, pp. xiv, 270, $2.40.) "This little book is designed to give such an account of the growth of English institutions as may be intelligible to those who are only beginning to read history" (p. v). Such was the purpose as stated in the preface to the first edition of the work in 1893. It should still serve that purpose very well. An additional chapter

has been added by Dr. A. Aspinall covering constitutional changes from 1901 down to, and including, the Government of India Act of 1935. An appendix prints a list of the names and positions of the cabinet ministers from 1914 to 1931. A satisfactory index is added but there are no bibliographical references of any kind. (JOHN TRACY ELLIS.)

MORE, PAUL ELMER, *On Being Human.* [Volume III of the New Shelburne Essays.] (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1936, pp. 202, $2.00.) Paul Elmer More, in the first essay of the nine which compose this volume, has a few refreshingly definite things to say about the vague thing called Humanism. First, that Humanism stands for "some superadded element or faculty . . ." that marks off a man as a man, thus opposing Naturalism (p. 7). Secondly, Humanism asserts that man is an individual personality, and has a free will and a sense of responsibility. Humanism, More assures us, is a great affirmation; Naturalism distorts and denies. Granting, note More does not say admitting, that some kind of religion is necessary for Humanism, such a religion must meet the following demands: it must be more than a vague acquiescence in a vague metaphysics; it must be a militant force, not an ivory-towered precious ornament; it must assure us that our practical sense of right and wrong, of beauty and ugliness, is justified by the eternal canons of Truth; it must give us the conviction that the world is not a product of chance; it must be a religion that will so knit the future with the present, so bind together the eternal and the temporal that the torment of frustration will be assuaged (p. 22).

The other essays deal mainly with certain men, writers and thinkers of interest today. The second is a study of his friend, Irving Babbitt. He describes the brilliance of his conversation; stresses the immobility of Babbitt's central ideas. He admits that Babbitt had really no use for positive Christianity or for the doctrine of divine Grace, for he insists that Babbitt based his teaching on what is of the earth, and, therefore, earthly. The following three essays are literary criticisms, with the keenness and style that we expect of More. What is the matter with Proust? would be a good sub-title to the first of these three. Proust, in brief, was immersed in Naturalism and his works are vapours floating up from a foundation of hysterical sadism and hysterical masochism which overlay the nature of man. Another literary essay is that on Joyce, and the question asked is, How did Joyce get that way? One of the great causes of his drop from the supernatural to the infranatural was his loss of his Catholic faith. The rest of the essay is an analysis of the book *Ulysses*. Why do the intellectuals study this book, asks More. One reason is the enormous amount of sheer intellection in the book; another is the great language which is in the work. More takes time out to deride Joyce's scholarship. He says that the pleasure of *Ulysses* has little to do with thought; the puzzle of getting sense out of apparent nonsense may have its reward. This work fascinates the intellectuals and engenders faith in the final reality of Nature as something loathsome to such an extent that man is relieved of the burden of loyalty to any authority outside himself—the vanity of the illusion of irresponsibility.

"In this art I see at work not the conviction of sin (cf. Mr. T. S. Eliot) but the ultimate principle of evil involved as the very enemy of truth" (p. 93).

In the essay on the Modernism of French Poetry, More attempts to show that the work of Joyce is a more or less exotic offshoot of a literary movement in France which ended in Surrealism and began in three American authors, Poe, Whitman and Henry James. Marcel Raymond's treatise *De Baudelaire au surrealisme* is analyzed at length. More pauses to annihilate Dr. René Laforgue's *L'Echec de Baudelaire* and to embrace Baron Ernest Seillière's study *Baudelaire*. In place of Seillière's theory of the two main impulses of the human soul, imperialism and mysticism, More sees as the root of the vomitings of the infranaturalists or Surrealists (Proust, Joyce, Baudelaire, Gide, etc.), the lust of irresponsibility, a rebellious hatred of responsibility to any overlordship of law, and a denial of any supernatural reality which can judge.

In Chapter VIII, he discusses Baron Von Hügel's attitude to religion; how he was inclined metaphysically to the worship of God. The most of the essay is a crude attempt of an ignorant man, as far as Catholic theology goes, to discuss the sublime doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God, and better left untouched by those whose eyes try to admire More and yet retain some hold on the truth that is at the center of the Christian Church. In the final essay, dealing with Milton's poem *Lycidas,* More offers the suggestion that the theme of it is the possible death of Milton himself. He shows how *Lycidas* is great literature, both in form, the language and imagination, and in content, especially in its nobility of matter. (NEIL F. O'CONNOR.)

NATALINI, DOTT. VINCENZO, *La Leggenda di S. Pietro Parenzo scritta dal Maestro Giovanni Canonico di Orvieto. Studi e testi.* (Roma, Lateranum, Ed. Instituto Grafico Tiberino, 1936, pp. xii, 211.) This mighty work of Church reform, started by Pope Gregory VII and happily continued with constancy and alacrity by his worthy successors on the chair of St. Peter, had led both Church and civil society to a true rebirth of Christian life and religious fervor, whose greatest exponents were St. Norbert and St. Bernard. Steadily progressing in its ascent, that revival of spiritual ardor reached its highest point of intensity under the pontificate of Innocent III, in the early part of the thirteenth century, with the appearance of two religious orders of a new type, the Franciscans and the Dominicans. But if those centuries, especially the twelfth and thirteenth, justly deserve to be remembered in the history of the Church as the period of the greatest spiritual maturity in the Middle Ages, they mark also the rising and fermenting of those errors and heresies, which for a bitter moment tried to kill, in the Church and in civil society as well, that germ of life which was everywhere developing. One of such heresies—the most dangerous and fearful of all—was that known under different names according to the places where it happened to be raging, but commonly known also by the generic names of Catharism. In this scholarly study, Dr. Natalini deals with a famous episode of that long and hard struggle—an episode that took place at Orvieto, in Umbria, more than fifty years before the martyrdom of St. Peter of Verona. The *Leggenda* Dr. Natalini

here studies, and edits from a contemporary beautiful manuscript which has been preserved in the Chapter Archives of the Duomo of Orvieto, may be considered as a precious source, not only for the history of the activity and martyrdom of St. Peter Parenzo (a young Roman nobleman who had been sent to Orvieto by Pope Innocent III as civil rector of the city) and for the local history, but also for the general history of the Catharistic movement in Northern and Central Italy. Hence its importance for the history of the Church in that period which immediately preceded the birth of the two above-mentioned orders. (C. I. C.)

NOTTER, HARLEY, *The Origins of the Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson.* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1937, pp. vi, 695, $4.50.) This volume by Dr. Notter is a distinct contribution to the literature on the foreign policy of Woodrow Wilson. Up to the present time scant attention has been paid to the origins of this policy, and most Americans have not realized that during the long period from 1913 to 1921 the President merely gave expression to principles that he had adopted many decades before he went to the White House. It is important to note that these principles had a deeply religious basis: throughout his entire career as college professor, college president, Governor of New Jersey and as President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson firmly believed that God was the inspiration behind every important item in his program of public service. He had early accepted the view that there is a moral law that is infinitely superior to man-made law, and this moral law is clearly expounded in the Bible. It was his earnest desire to shape his every public action in accordance with this moral law, and he was certain that there is "nothing that gives such pith to public service as religion."

From this starting point, it was merely a short step to the conviction that the history of nations is really "spiritual, not material, a thing not of institutions, but of the heart and the imagination." Nations as well as individuals had definite obligations to world society, and public duty demanded that right should be securely enthroned in a new world order. Soon after his election to the Presidency, Woodrow Wilson made the announcement that he would not "cry 'peace' so long as there is sin and wrong in the world." It was the manifest destiny of America to "serve humanity and bring liberty to mankind." In this struggle for righteousness, Americans should not be earth-bound by too strict a regard for tradition and for constitutional limitations: "The standards of morals transcend the standards of the Constitution."

These deep-seated religious convictions colored all of Wilson's political principles, and they gave a crusading zeal to his attempts at world betterment. In 1901, he strongly voiced the view that it was high time for the people of this nation to establish new frontiers of political thought; isolation should be abandoned in favor of world leadership. He believed that it was a grave mistake for Americans to regard George Washington's Farewell Address as an everlasting gospel against any intimate association with European nations. Our first President had merely warned his inexperienced

countrymen against premature European alignments. America was now faced with the duty of preparing the way for an effective Parliament of the World.

It is apparent from any study of the writings of Woodrow Wilson that he was a statesman who lived in a political stratosphere that was far removed from the realities of world politics. Although he failed in his fight for world peace, he pointed the way towards international understanding and clearly showed that good will among men can come only when humanity really listens to the call of Christ. If his efforts were in vain, it was largely because he was constantly working as the secretary of the spirit of human progress rather than as a mere recorder of human frailties. (C. TANSILL.)

Peace and the Clergy. By A GERMAN PRIEST. (New York, Sheed & Ward, 1936, pp. xiii, 166.) The author of these 166 pages has given the topic of Peace a deeper and wider treatment than is ordinarily allotted to it by Catholic writers. To the religious phase of this problem the author has done ample justice, and it is this aspect of the Peace Movement that gives this book its finest merit. The titles of the five well-written chapters will indicate to all Catholics, and especially to the clergy, why they should find this volume one of instruction and interest: The Urgency of Our Mission—The Religious Character of the Peace Movement—Christ and The Peace Movement—The Church and The Peace Movement—The Point at Issue. No one can read these chapters without being impressed; in many cases they will be inspired with the spirit of Saint Thomas More and Saint John Fisher, to whom this work is dedicated by the German priest who is the author. (L. L. MCVAY.)

PEASE, THEODORE CALVIN (Ed.), *Anglo-French Boundary Disputes in the West, 1749–1763.* [Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library, Volume XXVII, French Series, Volume II.] (Springfield, Ill., Trustees of the Illinois State Historical Library, 1936, pp. clxxi, 607.) An outstanding feature of this latest publication of the Illinois State Historical Library is the introduction by Professor Pease. It is a not too brief account of the Franco-English diplomacy of the Seven Years' War written from primary sources, and extensively documented. The result of the editor's labors deserves the highest commendation. He has made a scholarly contribution that would win the praise of critics if published as a separate monograph. Coupled as it is with the documentary material included in this volume, it promises to be of the greatest assistance to scholars working in the field of western development. The documents here published in their original versions, and in translation as well, are essential to an understanding of the boundary controversies between Great Britain and France in the region of the Mississippi and the Great Lakes, in the era of the Seven Years' War. Several maps and a satisfactory index are likewise included. (JOHN J. MENG.)

PINSK, JOHANNES, *Christianity and Race.* Translated by Conrad M. R. Bonacina, with a *Foreword* by Anscar Vonier, O.S.B., Abbot of Buckfast (*Essays in Order, New Series, No. 2*). (New York, Sheed and Ward, 1936, pp. xx, 96, $1.00.) In this book Dr. Pinsk of Berlin, well known for his interest in the liturgical movement, has dealt with a problem which has assumed such importance in Germany that it threatens to change the whole

aspect of German civilization. After an analysis of the mission and structure of the Church, the author propounds this thesis: "*the spirit of Christ was made flesh in the forms of the Roman-Hellenistic culture,* in other words, these forms were called to be the expression and bearers of Christ's spirit. *As the body of Christ was that of a Jewish man, so is the bodily manifestation of the Spirit of Christ in the Church, that of the Roman-Hellenistic Culture.*" Following a discussion of the implications contained in the acceptance of this thesis, he then proceeds to analyze the structural principle of the Germanic nature and to point out the causes and dangers of conflict between it and that of the Church. His conclusion is that, in spite of clashing elements, the true fulfillment of the German nation can only be realized through the fulfillment of the Church. The author has written a profound essay from the Catholic point of view on the problem of race psychology in relation to Catholic Christianity, and his slender but meaty book should do much to call the attention of American Catholics to a question which seems destined to become increasingly important far beyond the confines of Germany. I do not accept all the author's views, or at least without some qualification, but I find him very stimulating and thought-provoking even when I must disagree. (M. R. P. McGUIRE.)

RAEMERS, SIDNEY A., *Church History.* (St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co., 1936, pp. 3-454, $2.25.) Whenever an author who really knows the field of Church History essays to publish a manual of Church History for the use of secondary schools there ought to be rejoicing for there is great need of just that sort of volume. It is true that already there are several texts in the field but the needs of high school students are so various that no one text is apt to become exclusive. The present manual, as the author points out in the preface, in very large part is based upon Dom Poulet's Church History. Dom Poulet's standing in the field of Church history has been established long since; therefore, a review of the English work must be concerned principally with the quality of the translation and the adaptability of the text for the use of high school students. The translation is adequate. Usually only on the rarest occasions does the average translator succeed in rendering perfectly the clarity and force of the original. Dr. Raemers is much better than the average translator. As for the teachablenesss of this volume, that will depend largely upon the demands of the school curricula where it may be introduced. Some will regret that the book was not organized in units following the present practice of high school texts with the organization of the subsidiary sections clearly delineated and with appropriate prefatory matter preceding each unit as well as each of its subdivisions. Some may also feel that this Church history is not specifically co-related to the history of western Europe, and also to United States history which high school students must learn. There may be also a feeling that more attention should have been given to the Church in modern times. This complaint will almost certainly be made about the treatment of the Church in the United States and the Church and contemporary problems. Since this material comes at the end of the book the author may decide to enlarge that portion in future editions. (PHILIP FURLONG.)

RINES, EDWARD F., *Old Historic Churches of America.* (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1936, pp. vii, 373, $6.00.) This work is concerned primarily with old church buildings: the actual structures in which historic happenings took place. The author has covered a wide territory from New England to California, including the South, and has linked the historical, literary and architectural development of these churches in a remarkable manner. Christ Church in Alexandria, Va., Bruton Parish Church, Williamsburg, Va., Quaker Meeting House, Easton, Md., The Independent Church, Savannah, Ga., Old Cathedral of St. Louis of France, St. Louis, Mo., The Alamo Chapel, San Antonio, Texas, and the Old Russian Chapel at Fort Ross, California, is to mention but a few of the many types treated. Interesting mention is made of St. John's Church, Washington, D.C., and the Baltimore Cathedral, both the work of Benjamin H. Latrobe, the well-known architect.

It is difficult to realize that so many historic churches are to be found in America. Architectural design is tested to the utmost for flexibility to accord these churches the necessary esthetic interest that distinguishes all real architecture from mere buildings. The same material is found elsewhere and often in better form but scarcely ever in a more convenient, compact and interesting narrative. Much attention is given to dimensions of structures, thickness of walls, dates, etc., but these details are needed as an aid in visualizing the proportions and form of the plans. The architectural statements read as accurately as are to be expected. Appropriate literary excerpts interspersed throughout the book give the work an interesting character. In the introduction to Chapter VI is a quotation from Robert Louis Stevenson, "I never weary of great churches. It is my favourite kind of mountain scenery. Mankind was never so happily inspired as when it made a cathedral." The readers of this work will not weary of the great and little churches, their interesting appearances and thrilling histories as collected and re-told in this volume. (F. V. MURPHY.)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

The Catholic Church in 1937. J. F. O'Doherty (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, January).
The Philosophy of History. G. J. Garraghan (*Modern Schoolman*, January).
Literature as the Guide to History. Abraham Kaufman (*Social Studies*, March).
Fact and Interpretation in Historical Writing. R. L. P. Milburn (*Church Quarterly Review*, January-March).
The Teaching of the New History. L. J. Mannion (*Social Studies*, February).
Religion as a Factor in Human History. R. B. Mowatt (*Hibbert Journal*, January).
Protestant Tradition in Literature. J. B. Code (*Thought*, March).
Historismus und Geschichtsbewusstsein. Reinhard Wittram (*Historische Zeitschrift*, Bd. 157, heft 2).
The Value of "Lines of Development" in Stimulating the Pupil's Initiative. M. V. C. Jeffreys (*History*, December).
The Papacy in a Changing World. D. A. Binchy (*Studies*, December).

The Pope and the Bible. Vincent McNabb, O. P. (*Clergy Review*, March).
The Leaven and the Mass: the Pagan Background of the Early Church. John Murray (*Month*, February).
The Early Apologists and Christian Worship. M. H. Shepherd, Jr. (*Journal of Religion*, January).
Neues um den Gregorianischen Kalendar. Johannes Stein, S.J. (*Stimmen der Zeit*, January).
The Fathers of the Church. E. A. Ryan, S.J. (*Missionary*, February).
Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel. L. V. Lester-Garland (*Hibbert Journal*, January).
The First Catholic Version of the Greek New Testament in Portuguese. W. C. Taylor (*Review and Expositor*, January).
The Geneva Bible as a Political Document. Hardin Craig, Jr. (*Pacific Historical Review*, March).
Where Did Paul Persecute the Church? H. E. Dana (*Anglican Theological Review*, January).
Ephesus, Athens, Alexandria: 98-180, A.D. J. H. Crehan, S.J. (*Thought*, March).
Les Bibliothèques médiévales. J. de Ghellinck, S.J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, January).
Les Bibliothèques modernes. J. de Ghellinck, S.J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, February).
Capitalism and the Reformation. P. C. Gordon Walker (*Economic History Review*, November).
The Impressment of Masons in the Middle Ages. Douglas Knoop and G. P. Jones (*Economic History Review*, November).
Confession in the Dark Ages. Herbert Thurston. (*Month*, January). A commentary on H. C. Lea's *History of Auricular Confession*.
Franciscan Poverty and Civic Wealth as Factors in the Rise of Humanistic Thought. Hans Baron (*Speculum*, January).
Early Franciscan Missions. J. R. H. Moorman (*East and West Review*, January).
The Holy Inquisition: Suppression of Witnesses' Names (continued). Francis Darwin (*Church Quarterly Review*, January-March).
Western Missioners in Eastern Rites. J. H. Ryder, S.J. (*Dublin Review*, January).
The Settlement of the Church Property Question in Cuba. D. A. Lockmiller (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, November).
Haiti *vs.* Santo Domingo. J. B. Code (*Commonweal*, January 7).
Bibliographia Hispanoamericana. (*Revista Moderna*, July, 1937).
La cuestión del patronato en los periódicos. J. Garcia Gutiérrez (*Christus*, January).
El Patronato: un Intermedio de Historia Civil. J. G. Gutiérrez (*Christus*, March).
Frederico Gonzalez Suarez: Archevêque, patriote et historien de l'Équateur. Richard Pattee (*Canada Français*, January).
Argentina and the Papacy, 1810-1827. A. R. Wright (*Hispanic American Historical Review*, February).
Japan, China and the Faith. J. K. (*Month*, January).
La pénétration du catholicisme chez les Japonais cultivés. Jules Van Overmeeren, S.J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, December).
Le missioni dei francescani spagnuoli nel Giappone (1593-1597). Doroteo Schilling, O.F.M. (*Il Pensiero Missionario*, December).

EUROPEAN

St. Benedict. J. J. O'Connor (*Light*, February).
Saint Vincent de Paul. Mina J. Moore (*Dublin Review*, January).
Frederic Ozanam, Patriarch of the Lay Apostolate. J. J. Griffin (*Magnificat*, January).

Un aspect de l'oeuvre menaisienne. P. Broutin, S.J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, October, December).
Le cardinal Fesch et l'administration du diocèse de Lyon de 1803 à 1806. André Latreille (*La Révolution Française*, XII, no. 3).
Die Anfänge der französischen Lutherauffassung. Hans Leube (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, December).
An Estimation of the Importance of the Work of Monsieur Loisy. L. J. Collins (*Modern Churchman*, February).
Auxerre. Watkin Williams (*Dublin Review*, January).
Catholic Action in France. I. Marquis d'Aragon (*Dublin Review*, January). The Christian Workers Youth Movement.
French Catholics and Politics. R. J. Dingle (*Month*, February).
Predictions of Mother Rafols. Bernard Grimley (*Light*, March).
The Religious Revival under Salezar: Religion Restored to the Schools. R. S. Devane, S.J. (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, January).
Prelates and Nobles in the Rhineland: a Church Province in the Thirteenth Century. F. R. Lewis (*History*, December).
Hitler's Undeclared War on the Catholic Church. Waldemar Gurian (*Foreign Affairs*, January).
The Financial Relations of Church and State in Germany, 1919-1937. R. H. Wells (*Political Science Quarterly*, March).
Church and State in Germany. A. J. MacDonald (*Nineteenth Century*, March).
Niels Steensens religiöse Entwicklung. Hermann Grünewald, S.J. (*Stimmen der Zeit*, January).
Zur Entstehung des Historismus: Gedanken zu Friedrich Meineckes jüngstem Werk. Erich Seeberg (*Historische Zeitschrift*, Bd. 157, heft 2).
The Religion of Masaryk. Matthew Spinka (*Christendom*, Winter).
Belgium's Practical Faith. J. R. Kirwan (*Month*, January).
Galileo, a Martyr to Science? W. S. O'Byrne (*Truth*, December).
Pope Sammachus: a Review. W. T. Townsend (*Church Quarterly Review*, January-March).
La Yougoslavie depuis le concordat. John Keyser (*Nouvelle Revue*, January).
Peter the Great and the Establishment of the Russian Church. N. Zernov (*Church Quarterly Review*, January-March).
Vladimir Soloviev: a Russian Newman, 1853-1900. F. W. Hodge (*Dublin Review*, January).

BRITISH EMPIRE

St. Laurence O'Toole and the Anglo-Norman Invasion. J. F. O'Doherty (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, February).
"Mariolatry": Anglo-Saxon and Irish. Herbert Thurston (*Month*, February).
Alfred the Great. J. J. O'Connor (*Light*, March).
Tudor Humanism and Henry VIII. Douglas Bush (*University of Toronto Quarterly*, January).
A Versatile Jacobean Sir Kenelm Digby, 1603-1665. W. J. Blyton (*Month*, January).
Edmund Burke, England, and the Papacy. H.V.F. Somerset (*Dublin Review*, January).
Cardinal Manning (1808-92). Fidelis Gilsenan, O.P. (*Dominicana*, December).
The Library of St. Radegund's Abbey. A. H. Sweet (*English Historical Review*, January).
St. Margaret of Scotland. Baron Béla Malcomes (*Hungarian Quarterly*, Winter).
Early Hymns in the Irish Church. A. J. Reilly (*America*, March 19).
Charles Wogan, Soldier and Diplomatist. H. A. Law (*Dublin Review*, January). Irish Jacobite.
The Religious Orders in Medieval Wales. F. R. Lewis (*Month*, February).

Sillery: First Canadian Reduction, 1637. T. F. O'Connor (*Commonweal*, December 24).

John Bede Polding, XV. J. J. McGovern (*Australasian Catholic Record*, January).

UNITED STATES

John Franklin Jameson. (*American Historical Review*, January).

Some Suggestions to American Historians. G. S. Ford (*American Historical Review*, January). Presidential address of the American Historical Association.

The Philosophy of the Constitution. M. F. X. Millar, S.J. (*Thought*, March).

Negro Sisterhoods in the United States. J. B. Code (*America*, January 8).

Thomas Paine: Deist or Quaker? R. P. Falk (*Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, January).

A Colored Catholic Educator before the Civil War. J. B. Code (*Catholic World*, January). Mother Mary Lange.

Genius of the Civil War. Elizabeth S. Kite (*Commonweal*, March 11). Gen. W. T. Sherman.

Der Wahreitsfreund (The Friend of Truth). George Timpe, P.S.M. (*Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, December). First German Catholic newspaper in U. S., founded July 20, 1837.

Irish Cultural Contribution in Early New York. R. J. Purcell (*Catholic Educational Review*, January, February).

Notes on the Early History of St. Joseph's Parish at Utica, N. Y. Maurice Imhoff, O.M.C. (*Central-Blatt and Social Justice*, February).

Thumbnail Sketches of Allegany [N. Y.] Pioneers (concluded). (*Provincial Annals*, January).

The Religion of the Ojibwa of Northern Minnesota. Sr. Bernard Coleman, O.S.B. (*Primitive Man*, July and October).

Yellow Fever in Memphis in the 1870's. G. M. Capers, Jr. (*Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, March). References to Catholic losses and to the aid ministered by priests and nuns.

Troublous Times in New Mexico, 1659-1670 (continued). F. V. Scholes (*New Mexico Historical Review*, January).

The Neapolitan Jesuits on the Colorado Frontier, 1868-1919. J. M. Espinosa (*Colorado Magazine*, March).

Locations of the Early Spanish Missions and Presidio in Nacogdoches County. R. B. Blake (*Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, January).

Nuestra Señora de la Purisima Concepción: Story of an Old Spanish Mission in San Antonio, Texas. Frances Donecker (*Quarterly Bulletin of the International Federation of Catholic Alumnae*, December).

Cornelia Connelly: a Valiant Woman. Mary F. Windeatt (*Magnificat*, January). Foundress of the Society of the Holy Child of Jesus.

Mother Cabrine. J. B. Code (*Commonweal*, December 17).

Memoirs of Lurana Mary Francis, Mother Foundress of the Franciscan Sisters of the Atonement (continued). E. U. Lex (*Lamp*, January, February, March).

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here does not preclude extended notice in the REVIEW.)

Allison, John M. S., *Malesherbes: Defender and Reformer of the French Monarchy: 1721-94* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1938, pp. vi, 177. $2.50).

Bates, Robert C., *L'Hystore Job: adaptation en vers français du Compendium in Job de Pierre de Blois* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937, pp. xxx, 293. $3.00). A first and sumptuous edition of this anonymous 13th-14th century poem in Picard dialect with notes and a complete glossary. A sermon in verse freely adapted from the 12th century work of Peter of Blois, which in turn was based on Gregory's *Moralia*. The poet adds to Peter's sharp criticism of contemporary morals.

Belaunde, Victor Andrew, *Bolivar and the Political Thought of the Spanish American Revolution* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1938, pp. xxiv, 451. $3.50).

Biondi, Biondo, *La Categoria Romana delle "Servitutes"* (Milano: Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero", 1938, pp. 71, 706).

Burdach, Konrad, *Vom Mittelalter zur Reformation: Forschungen zur Geschichte der Deutschen Bildung* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Achter Band, 1937, pp. xxxii, 554).

Butler, Nicholas Murray, *Philosophy* (New York: Columbia University, 1903, pp. 51).

Buzio, Carlo, *Esiodo nel Mondo Greco sino alla Fine dell'età Classica* (Milano: Società Editrice "Vita e Pensiero", 1938, pp. xi, 164).

Carrière, Joseph Medard, *Tales from the French Folk-Lore of Missouri* (Evanston and Chicago: Northwestern University, 1937, pp. viii, 354. $4.00). What students of folk-lore have done for other ethnical groups of North and Central America, the author of this interesting volume has done for the Creoles of Missouri, especially around Ste. Genevieve.

Cate, James Lea, and Anderson, Eugene N. (Editors), *Medieval and Historiographical Essays in Honor of James Westfall Thompson* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1938, pp. x, 499. $4.50).

Clapham, J. H., *An Economic History of Modern Britain* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938, pp. xiv, 577. $7.00).

D'Armagnac, M. M., *Huysmans en les Frontières du Chrétien* (Paris: Bonne Presse, pp. vi, 197).

Denomy, Alexander Joseph, *The Old French Lives of St. Agnes and other Vernacular versions of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938, pp. xi, 283. $4.00).

de Vries, Josepho, S. J., *Critica in usum scholarum* (St. Louis: Herder, 1937, pp. xiii, 176. $1.50).

Donohue, James J., *The Torchbearer* (Dubuque, Iowa: Columbia College Press, 197, pp. 26). A masque of the religious orders for the centennial of the Archdiocese of Dubuque.

———, *Hid Battlements* (Dubuque, Columbia College Press, 1937, pp. 145). Centennial pageant of the Archdiocese of Dubuque.

Duhamelet, G., *Nouvelet (Le P. Claude Allez, A.A.), le mouvement noëliste* (Paris: Bonne Presse, 1937, pp. 228).

Dunham, W. H., and Pargellis, Stanley, *Complaint and Reform in England* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1938, pp. xxxv, 925. $4.00).

Duckett, Eleanor Shipler, *The Gateway to the Middle Ages* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938, pp. xii, 620. $5.00).

Enrich, Alvin C., and Elmo, C. Wilson, *In 1937* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1938, pp. x, 523. $2.00). This is a superficial journalistic account of 1937 world affairs. The chapters on religion and the Spanish Civil War are especially ridiculous.

Fechter, Rolf, *Der Aussaetizige Pater Damian de Veuster und Hawai* (Freiburg i/B.: Herder, 1937, pp. 168. $1.15).

Fellette, Hieronymus A., O. M. Cap., *S. Laurentii a Brundusio Activitate Apostolica ac Operibus* (Venetiis: Typogr. S. Marci, 1937, pp. xxxvi, 309).

Fortier, James J. A., Editor, *General Zachary Taylor, the Louisiana President of the United States of America* (New Orleans: Louisiana State Museum, 1937, pp. 70. $0.25).

Ghesquière, Dom Théodore, *Mathieu de Castro, premier vicaire apostolique aux Indes. Une Création de la Propaganda à ses Débuts* (Louvain: Bureaux de la Revue, 1937, pp. 149).

Hanke, Lewis, Editor, *Handbook of Latin American Studies: A Guide to Material published in 1936* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937, pp. xv, 515).

Hoffman, Ross, *Tradition and Progress* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1938, pp. xvii, 165. $2.00).

Holmes, Thomas J., and Murdock, Kenneth B., *Manuductio ad Ministerium* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1938, pp. xix, 151. $2.00).

Hüffer, Maria, *Die Reformen in der Abtei Fijnsburg im 15. Jahrhundert* (Münster: Aschendorff., 1938, pp. xci, 198, 6.56 RM.).

Hughes, Philip, *Pope Pius the Eleventh* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1937, pp. x, 318. $3.00).

Hulme, Edward Maslin, *The Middle Ages* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., rev. ed., 1938, pp. xvii, 1118. $4.50).

Jones, Paul V. B., *Analytical Survey of Modern European History with assignments and special exercises* (New York: Macmillan, 1937, part I (1500-1830), pp. 46; part II (1815-1937), pp. 52. Each $1.00). Designed to meet the needs of an introductory course in modern European history with principal assignments based on Hayes' *Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe*. Excellent map studies, and a unique appendix of perforated *fiches* for the control of students' reading. Rich in bibliographical references.

Lake, Sara E. and Gray, A. A., (Editors), *The History of Lower California by Don Francisco Javier Clavigero, S.J.* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1937, pp. xxvii, 413. $4.00).

Landgraf, Artur, *Commentarius Cantabrigiensis in Epistolas Pauli e Schola Petri Abaelardi: 1. in Epistolam Ad Romanos* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, *Publication in Mediaeval Studies*, II, 1937, pp. xlii, 223).

Lincoln, Anthony, *English Dissent 1763-1800* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938, pp. 292. $2.50).

Lodge, Eleanor C., and Somerville, Robert, *John of Gaunt's Register, 1379-1383*, Vol. I, Camden Third Series, Vol. LVI (London, Offices of the Royal Historical Society, 1937, pp. l, 233). This volume begins the edition of a companion codex in 152 folios to *John of Gaunt's Register, 1371-1375*, edited by S. Armitage-Smith. The present volume contains a valuable introduction of some forty pages and edits the manuscript to folio 63a. Most of the entries are in French. The register for the

most part throws only indirect light on the stirring political events of the period. It is chiefly valuable for the information it gives on the duke's estates, their organization and management.

Lunt, W. E., *History of England* (New York: Harper & Brothers, rev. ed., 1938, pp. xvi, 920. ($4.25).

Masson, Robert L., and Stratton, Samuel, *Financial Instruments and Institutions* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938, pp. xix, 494. $3.00).

McCann, Paul, *A Valiant Bishop against a Ruthless King* (St. Louis: Herder, 1938, pp. x, 277. $2.50).

McNabb, Fr. Vincent, O.P., *The Church and Reunion* (London: Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1938, pp. x, 236. 6sh.).

McNabb, Vincent, O.P., *St. Elizabeth of Portugal* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1939, pp. 62. $1.00).

Maschi, Carlo Alberto, *La Concezione Naturalistica del Diritto e degli Instituti Giuridici Romani* (Milano: Società Editrice "Vita E Pensiero", 1937, pp. xix, 395).

Morgan, William Thomas, *A Bibliography of British History* (Bloomington, Indiana, University of Indiana Press, Vol. I (1700-1715), 1934, pp. xvii, 524; Vol. II (1700-1715), pp. vi, 684).

Neatby, Hilda M., *The Administration of Justice Under the Quebec Act* (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1937, pp. v, 383). In an attempt to clear up some of the confusion over the judicial system which prevailed in the Old Province of Quebec after 1775, the author of this study examines the clash of the English common law with the Roman law of France and throws light on many of the social and political issues of that time.

Nielen, Joseph Maria, *Gebet und Gottes Dienst im Neuen Testament* (St. Louis: Herder, 1937, pp. xxiv, 356. $3.60). A critical and systematic presentation of the community-worship and liturgy of the Church during the period in which the New Testament was written. To explain this the author begins with a study of the prayer of Christ, His attitude toward Jewish worship, and a consideration of the influence of Jewish and pagan worship on the form of the Christian cult. A serious, well-documented, but rather heavy piece of work.

Perkins, Dexter, *The Monroe Doctrine: 1867-1907* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1937, pp. ix, 480. $3.50).

Poblaudura, P. Melchiore, *Relationes De Origine Ordinis Minorum Capuccinorum — Monumenta Historica Ordinis Minorum Capuccinorum*, Vol. I, *Marius A. Mercano Saraceno, O.M.Cap.* (Assisi, Collegio S. Lorenzo da Brindisi, 1937, pp. 552).

Prince, J. F. T., *Creative Revolution* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1937, pp. xiii, 106. $1.50). This treatise on the revolution which the author feels would naturally grow out of the application of the principles of Christ, is an exceedingly interesting and sane treatment of current problems and their solution through Christian social reform.

Purcell, A. A., S.J., Editor, *Thomas de Quincey's Joan of Arc and The English Mail* (New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1938, pp. lxxx, 90. $0.60).

Pfeiffer, P. Pancratius, *Father Francis Mary of the Cross Jordan*, trans. by Rev. Winfrid Herbst, S.D.S. (St. Nazianz: Society of Divine Savior, 1936, pp. 574).

Qualey, Carlton C., *Norwegian Settlement in the United States* (Northfield, Minn.: Norwegian American Historical Association, 1938, pp. vii, 285. $3.00).

Ronan, Myles V., C.C., *Erasmus Smith Endowment* (Dublin: The Talbot Smith Press, Ltd., 1937, pp. 80). A valuable addition to Irish history.